

259090

JPRS-TAC-86-064

11 AUGUST 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

19990422 100

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

8
109
A16

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

11 AUGUST 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

UK Businessmen To Work With Government on SDI Contracts (Quentin Cowdry; London DAILY TELEGRAPH, 28 Jun 86).....	1
Canada: SDI Attacked at Physicists Meeting (Windsor THE WINDSOR STAR, 25 Jun 86).....	2
UK Government Funds for Companies Working on Eureka Projects (Roland Gribben; London DAILY TELEGRAPH, 26 Jun 86).....	3
XINHUA Hails Eureka Progress, European Unity (Li Shuxun; Beijing XINHUA 18 Jul 86).....	4
PRC CD Representative Urges Banning Space Weapons (Beijing XINHUA, 22 Jul 86).....	6

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

French General Analyzes Gorbachev Proposal (Pierre Gallois; Paris LE FIGARO ECONOMIE, 30 Jun 86)...	7
FRG's Kohl Welcomes Latest Soviet Arms Proposals (Hamburg DPA, 25 Jun 86).....	11
Press Notes FRG's Kohl Speech on Disarmament (Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network, 26 Jun 86).....	12

Kohl Welcomes New Soviet Disarmament Initiatives (Hamburg DPA, 2 Jul 86; Hamburg ARD, 2 Jul 86).....	13
Possible 'Second Summit' Discussed Feller Interviews Kohl	13 13
Soviet Arms Negotiators in Bonn for Talks (Hamburg DPA, 6, 7 Jul 86).....	15
Preview on Talks Genscher Meets USSR's Karpov Karpov on Summit 'Preconditions'	15 15 16
PRC: 'New Trends' in U.S.-USSR Disarmament Issue (Zheng Dexin; Beijing GUANGMING RIBAO, 15 Jul 86).....	17
SALT/START ISSUES	
Canadian Editorial Calls Reagan Stance on SALT 'Confusing' (Vancouver THE SUN, 16 Jun 86).....	19
PRC Journal Views Reagan Announcement To Abandon SALT II (Han Bin, Zhuang Maocheng; Beijing SHIJIE ZHISHI, No 13, 1 Jul 86).....	20
INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES	
IZVESTIYA Cites KYODO on U.S. Deployments in Europe, Asia (S. Agafonov; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 12 Jul 86).....	23
CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS	
Soviet Disarmament Expert on Chemical Weapons (Hamburg DPA, 10 Jul 86).....	24
FRG's SPD Disarmament Expert Discusses Chemical Weapons (Hamburg DPA, 11 Jul 86).....	25
Briefs U.S.-Soviet Consultations Close	26
EUROPEAN CONFERENCES	
Soviet Reportage on End of CDE Session in Stockholm (Various sources, various dates).....	27
Grinevskiy Comments Noted, by Vitaliy Ilyashenko Progress Analyzed 'Breakthrough' on Air Notification, by Nikolay Vukolov European Situation Seen Favorable, by Aleksandr Zholkver U.S. Delegate Cited, by A. Sychev	27 27 28 29 30

USSR: Pact, NATO Attitudes on European Arms Cuts Contrasted (V. Olgin; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 23 Jul 86).....	32
---	----

Briefs

Soviet Official on Arms Control	35
---------------------------------	----

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS on Opening of U.S.-Soviet Test Ban Talks (Moscow TASS, 21, 24 Jul 86).....	36
--	----

Foreign Ministry Press Conference	36
U.S. Attitude Questioned	36

USSR: International Scientists' Forum To End Nuclear Tests (Various sources, various dates).....	38
---	----

Meeting With Gorbachev	38
Scientists Hold Press Conference	48
Forum Issues Declaration	51
'New Thinking' Gaining Ground, by Aleksandr Zholkver	52
'Important Landmark', by Tomas Kolesnichenko	53

Soviet Reports on U.S. Scientists in USSR To Monitor Tests (Various sources, various dates).....	54
---	----

Press Briefing	54
Report From Kazakhstan	55
Scientists Cited, by V. Itkin, L. Chernenko	56
Detect U.S. Test in Nevada, by V. Itkin, L. Chernenko	59

USSR's Israelyan Discusses Test Ban Verification at CD (Moscow TASS, 22 Jul 86).....	62
---	----

Moscow 'Top Priority' Discusses Nuclear Test Moratorium (Vladimir Posner, et al.; Moscow, 20 Jul 86).....	64
--	----

USSR: U.S. 17 July Nevada Test Assailed (Various sources, various dates).....	69
--	----

U.S. Opposition Noted, by Nikolay Turkatenko	69
Soviet Stand Reiterated, by Viktor Levin	70
U.S., Soviet Stances Contrasted, by Valentin Zorin	71
Worldwide Condemnation Noted, by Vladimir Pasko	71
U.S. Media Ignore Event, by G. Vasilyev	72

TASS: U.S. Nuclear Testing in Micronesia Assailed at UN (Vyacheslav Chernyshev; Moscow TASS, 13 May 86).....	74
---	----

USSR's Kapitsa Interviewed on Monitoring Issue (Sergey Kapitsa Interview; Budapest Domestic Service, 19 Jul 86).....	76
--	----

PRC Press Cites Korean Statement on U.S. Nuclear Armories (Xu Baokang; Beijing RENMIN RIBAO, 18 Jul 86).....	78
Briefs	
TASS Cites U.S. Veterans	79
RELATED ISSUES	
USSR: Reports, Comments on Shevardnadze Visit to Britain (Various sources, various dates).....	80
UK Political Scene Viewed, by A. Maslennikov	80
Shevardnadze Arrival Statement	83
Commentary on Relations, by Nikolay Gorshkov	84
Visit Tied to World Issues, by Aleksandr Pogodin	85
Talks With Thatcher, Howe	85
Shevardnadze, Howe Speeches, by Aleksandr Yevstigneyev, Vitaliy Chukseyev	87
Howe Comments on Talks	91
Shevardnadze London Press Conference	91
Politburo Discusses Visit	95
Importance of Visit, by Aleksandr Zholkver	95
'Political Goodwill High', by Nikolay Gorshkov	96
IZVESTIYA Commentary, by A. Krivopalov	97
Importance for East-West Ties, by Vsevolod Ovchinnikov, et al.	98
PRAVDA on Agreements, by V. Menshikov	101
USSR's Chervov Discusses Chemical Weapons, UK Nuclear Arms (David Adamson; London DAILY TELEGRAPH, 5 Jul 86).....	102
Briefs	
NATO Nuclear Weapons in Italy	103

/12223

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

UK BUSINESSMEN TO WORK WITH GOVERNMENT ON SDI CONTRACTS

London DAILY TELEGRAPH in English 28 Jun 86 p 36

[Article by Quentin Cowdry]

[Text]

A TOP-LEVEL team of British businessmen is to be seconded to the Defence Ministry to support its efforts to win for Britain a bigger share of the United States' multi-billion pound Star Wars programme, the Ministry announced last night.

The announcement came amid growing claims that Britain, which has clinched orders totalling £15 million since December when an Anglo-American "memorandum of understanding" was signed establishing ground rules for Star Wars contracts, is not achieving a fair share of the programme.

The Government says that could mean a £1.5 billion bonanza for UK firms.

The "industrial support unit," headed by Mr Jim Powell, 51, a senior British Aerospace executive who worked on the up-dating of Britain's Polaris nuclear deterrent, will augment the 26-strong Whitehall team currently overseeing Britain's participation in President Reagan's ambitious defence initiative.

Mr Powell, who is joining the Whitehall team on Monday, has been charged with recruiting up to 10 middle-to-senior executives by the autumn to staff up the unit.

The executives, who officials explained, would probably be in the £30,000 a year bracket, will remain on their companies' pay-

rolls, but the MoD has budgeted up to £150,000 a year to cover their travelling and other expenses. The secondments will last between one and two years.

Early warning

Officials said the "pay-off" for the co-operating companies would be that they would gain an invaluable insight into the workings of the MoD and the U.S. defence procurement machine.

The MoD said the move had not been in response to Britain's alleged lacklustre performance in winning Star Wars business.

But officials privately admit the contracts won so far are "peanuts" compared to what the UK could achieve, particularly if the programme to create a non-nuclear anti-missile defence advances beyond the research stage.

The unit's brief is to provide early warning of impending Star Wars projects by building up links in the Pentagon and other U.S. state agencies and to identify lucrative sub-contracting opportunities for UK firms.

British firms have so far won five small Star Wars research contracts, together worth about £1 million. In addition, two government-to-government contracts have been signed worth £14.3 million.

Earlier this week Mr Steel, Liberal leader, said Mrs Thatcher had approved the Star Wars programme after being offered "30 pieces of silver" from President Reagan, but had

ended up only getting a couple of coins.

Dr Stanley Orman, director general of the Strategic Defence Initiative participation office at the MOD, said the unit was "an excellent example" of industry and Government working together for the benefit of all.

"The team will be provided by a limited number of companies but will support all firms which wish to participate in the research project. The contributing companies will have no direct gain, other than the broadening of the staff".

He added: "I believe the formation of the team will bring a significant contribution towards industrial participation and the securing of contracts that will broaden our industrial base".

ends

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

CANADA: SDI ATTACKED AT PHYSICISTS MEETING

Windsor THE WINDSOR STAR in English 25 Jun 86 p D9

[Text]

EDMONTON (CP) — The United States' Star Wars defence program won't have to be perfect to achieve its goal of deterring a Soviet nuclear attack, a top American research official told physicists here Tuesday.

But Louis Marquet, head of the strategic defence initiative research office, admitted 100 Soviet warheads would get through to strike North American targets even if the program using laser and particle beam weapons was 99 per cent effective.

That would be devastating, he told delegates to the annual meeting of the Canadian Association of Physicists. But the Soviets would think twice before launching an initial attack because they don't have the assurance they could stop a retaliatory attack.

Marquet often found himself defending the program endorsed by U.S. President Ronald Reagan before a skeptical and sometimes openly hostile audience.

When one delegate questioned him about the danger from thousands of nuclear explosions in space, Marquet suggested it would be better to have a war in space than on earth.

"Wouldn't arms control negotiations be better than either?" another delegate asked.

"If you believe that productive disarmament can solve the problem, that's good," Marquet replied. "That's clearly better than having a war, and I endorse that approach."

THE DISCUSSION became heated when one delegate suggested the Star Wars program itself is a hindrance to arms control negotiations and could lead to widespread poisoning of the atmosphere through a nuclear war in space.

But Marquet said the program is aimed to prevent such a scenario in the first place.

"The question is how do we do that with an adversary who relentlessly pursues his offensive systems," he added. "Clearly it's important to continue to dialogue and explore various proposals for arms control. But it's difficult to take at face value the word of a country that is flagrantly violating all arms controls ever made."

Marquet said there is an enormous difference between an open society like the United States and a closed society like that of the Soviet Union.

"There is a fundamental difference in our societies and if you don't believe it, I'm sorry for you," he told several hecklers. "That is one of the problems we have in negotiating with and trusting the Soviets."

Any negotiations must be backed by capabilities that impose a strong

desire on the Soviets to keep their word concerning arms control, he added.

"Talk is fine. Reduction is fine. But don't throw all your tools away."

EARLIER, a Canadian laser physicist told the conference the Star Wars program — currently being advanced by Reagan as a \$25-billion plan to research advances in technology — is technically impractical and economically exorbitant.

H.M. Van Drell of the University of Toronto said hitting an intercontinental ballistic missile with a laser beam from 40,000 km (24,800 miles) out in space would be like an Edmontonian trying to shoot down a pencil in Toronto's downtown.

And the electrical power requirements for a system to destroy 1,000 missiles would be equivalent to about 60 per cent of the existing total American generating capacity.

That would keep about 1,000 power plants busy at a cost of \$100 billion a year, Van Drell explained.

There are many technical problems that would be extremely difficult to resolve, he pointed out, adding there are no guarantees the system would ever operate efficiently enough to be effective.

The physicist said the only way to achieve peace is through deterrence based on mutually assured destruction.

/13046

CSO: 5220/46

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

UK GOVERNMENT FUNDS FOR COMPANIES WORKING ON EUREKA PROJECTS

London DAILY TELEGRAPH in English 26 Jun 86 p 4

[Article by Roland Gribben]

[Text] GOVERNMENT aid of £50 million a year for British companies involved in European advanced technology projects will be announced on Monday by Mr Pattie, Information Technology Minister.

The assistance will be unveiled at the end of a conference in London of ministers from 18 nations involved in the Eureka project, initially designed to provide a European counter to the United States Star Wars initiative.

The funding will come out of existing aid for technology and innovation schemes. No new money is being advanced.

But Mr Pattie expects every £1 of state help to be matched by up to £4 of private sector money and total United Kingdom spending on projects could build up to £1.2 billion over a period of years.

About 50 new members are expected to be approved by Ministers with British companies involved in about half of them. So far 26 have been cleared, ranging from micro-computers for education to the development of high-powered laser systems and a diagnosis kit for Aids and other sexually transmitted diseases.

Britain has been co-ordinating developments since it was decided to change the emphasis from a European Star Wars rival to pooling resources to produce technologically advanced products to help European firms.

Mr Pattie yesterday described the Eureka project as probably Europe's last chance to create strong high-technology-based companies capable of competing with Japanese and United States rivals.

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

XINHUA HAILS EUREKA PROGRESS, EUROPEAN UNITY

OW181830 Beijing XINHUA in English 1739 GMT 18 Jul 86

["News Analysis: Rapid Progress for Western Europe's Eureka Program (by Li Shuxun)" -- XINHUA headline]

[Text] Beijing, July 18 (XINHUA) -- One year has passed since the Eureka program was made known to the world, and already the gains made by Western Europe are more outstanding than in any previous international multi-cooperative program.

When French President Francois Mitterrand first proposed the "Eureka" cooperation program in April, 1985, the program immediately drew great attention from all West European nations. Due to a generally positive response to the proposal, Eureka has enjoyed healthy and rapid progress since its birth.

The number of Eureka member nations is now 19 after Iceland was granted membership at the third ministerial meeting of the member nations on June 30. As well, the 21-nation Council of Europe has expressed its readiness to participate in five Eureka projects, which means that almost all of Western Europe will be involved in the program.

The number of projects designed for Eureka has jumped from the original 10 to 72, involving almost all fields of high-technology. More and more small, medium and large Western European enterprises have been attracted to the program.

France is taking the lead so far, participating in 40 projects, while Britain is taking part in 28 and Federal Germany in 19.

Together with these achievements, the decision to set up a seven-member Secretariat in Brussels is also considered as an important step. The Secretariat will serve as a permanent establishment for the ministerial conference and an information center responsible for coordinating projects.

Eureka enjoys a good reputation in the world for its policy of both working for Europe and with the developing world, and a number of Third World nations have shown an increasing interest in the program. Some have even expressed a desire to join in.

Eureka is expected to encompass 200 high-tech projects valued at 20 billion U.S. dollars in the coming five to 10 years. The program will promote Europe-wide cooperation in advanced technology industries, establish a high-tech network, and develop new competitive consumer goods, thus revitalizing the Western European economy.

The final goal of Eureka is to put Western Europe, which is not content to playing a supporting role in the world of rapid technological development, in the position it believes it deserves, that of a high technology leader.

Both officials and public opinion in Western Europe seem satisfied with the Eureka's achievements thus far, saying it has achieved "surprising success" and is "full of vigor."

The rapid progress of the Eureka project will have a profound effect on the era for a number of reasons. First: in terms of economics and technology, Western Europe started into new technologies late, missing out because as new technological markets were broadening the speed of production and Western Europe's share of the high-tech market were declining. Since 1972, the annual growth rate of production of high-tech products in Japan has been 14 percent while in the United States it has been much less, 7.6 percent, while Europe trails at less than five percent.

In 1980, West European, Japanese and American companies accounted for 26 percent, 15 percent and 46 percent respectively of world electronics production; by 1985, Western Europe's share had declined to 21 percent, while Japan has climbed to 21 percent and the U.S. was roughly the same, at 47 percent. Western Europe's share had dropped five percent in five years. Between 1979 and 1984, the European Economic Community's electronics trade deficit with Japan and the United States increased from 3.9 billion and 5.6 billion U.S. dollars to 8.5 billion and 10.8 billion U.S. dollars respectively. A radical change in such an economic situation for Western Europe is urgent.

Secondly: when it comes to politics and military strategies, the United States and the Soviet Union are competing in the development of high technologies. The arms race of the two superpowers is expanding into space and Europe will be the first to be threatened. Europeans realize that only a united, strong Europe with a robust economy and excellent technological capabilities can be strong and secure.

Federal German Chancellor Helmut Kohl said recently that no European country alone could meet the technological challenges of the United States and Japan. Only a Europe united in both financial resources and manpower can keep its economic position in the world of the future, he added.

Kohl's remarks, which reflect a common feeling among Western European politicians, show the reasons why Eureka has developed so quickly since it was unveiled one year ago.

/12858

CSO: 5200/4057

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

PRC CD REPRESENTATIVE URGES BANNING SPACE WEAPONS

OW221434 Beijing XINHUA in English 1418 GMT 22 Jul 86

[Text] Geneva, July 22 (XINHUA) -- Chinese representative Fan Guoxiang today called for reaching new international agreements on the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

At the summer session of the United Nations Geneva Conference on Disarmament, Fan said, "It is a cause of deep concern that the advanced space technology in the hands of the major space powers has been used to pursue their arms race and to strive for military preponderance."

"The major space powers' efforts to use outer space for military activities will lead to further escalation of the arms race and thus pose a greater threat to world peace," he said.

He said such activities include launching military satellites, buildup of a military satellite system, searching for anti-satellite technologies and developing more sophisticated space weapons capable of destroying nuclear missiles by the two superpowers.

"The development of space weapons has caused great anxiety and concern throughout the international community," he stressed.

Although current international agreements "reaffirmed the exclusively peaceful uses of outer space," they are "inadequate" because they contain no provisions explicitly banning the arms race, military activities or weapons in outer space, Fan said.

Fan also appealed to both Washington and Moscow to "engage in earnest negotiations for the speedy conclusion of an agreement without prejudice to the interests of other states."

The 40-nation Conference on Disarmament meets annually, holding sessions in the spring and summer.

/12858

CSO: 5200/4055

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

FRENCH GENERAL ANALYZES GORBACHEV PROPOSAL

Paris LE FIGARO ECONOMIE in French 30 Jun 86 p 80

[Article by Pierre Gallois]

[Text] There are some hypotheses that, if confirmed, would turn the world order upside down. What we know about the results of Geneva 1986 permits formulation of at least two such hypotheses:

This is the first. Mr Gorbachev's proposal for a general nuclear disarmament exceeds--of one can put it this way--the "hopes" of Mr Reagan. The latter had justified his long-range space shield plan by arguing that this defensive system would make nuclear strategic weapons useless, and humanity would thus be progressively liberated from the nuclear threat. He had also called for elimination of long-range theater nuclear weapons (the SS-20's on the one hand, and the Pershings on the other), and made the disarmament agreements subject to effective verification, which only "on-site" inspection could insure.

Not only did Mr Gorbachev endorse all these proposals, but again he added to them by specifying that such a great unburdening, never before planned or even imagined in the course of history, should be completed in 1999. And Marshal Akhromeev, chief of general staff of the Soviet armies, has declared himself ready to have destroyed, under international verification, the nuclear theater weapons that the Soviet Union has nonetheless deployed with such stubbornness despite the protests of the Atlantic Alliance countries. Prior to this memorable Moscow press conference of 18 January, no one could have believed that a marshal of the Soviet Union would propose sending to the scrap heap a very recent weaponry, a decisive element in the Warsaw Pact's superiority in Europe and the Far East, a trump in the Kremlin's general strategy, and the justification for one of the largest commands in the Soviet forces.

Is this a huge political-diplomatic trick? Is Mr Gorbachev counting on the grain of sand (it would be plausible if Peking, citing its security needs, refused to support the plan of the USSR Communist Party general secretary) that would jam his disarmament machine, while giving him the benefit of an initiative apparently in accord with public desires? Or, on the other hand, an audacious hypothesis, has the new team ruling the Soviet Union realized the advantages that its country would derive from elimination of nuclear weapons?

In a world in which the atom had been banned, the fact is that the Soviet Union, and it alone, has all the qualifications for power through resort to arms. There are five of these, all determining.

First, population. The bigger the population, the better it supplies big battalions, and the more decisive will be the mass of combatants assembled under a single political leadership and military command. With 280 million people, the Soviet Union has the advantage of power through demographic wealth.

Next, heavy industry. It produces the weapons (conventional) necessary to equip the ground, air and sea forces, and it must be able to match the millions of soldiers that a generous population provides to the leadership. This has been true for a long time in the case of Soviet heavy industry. It provides more weapons to the Warsaw Pact armies than all the other weapons industries combined.

Size of territory is another factor of strength that the combination of nuclear explosive and the rocket have virtually eliminated. Geography helps Russia. Large portions of its territory are both inaccessible by land and easily defensible against air and naval incursions. The Soviet command has fallback area, it can maneuver over broad areas, it can exchange ground for a gain in time, and it can rely on the distances in mounting its counter attacks. These are advantages that other countries do have, but not to the same degree as the Soviet Union.

Being favorably situated on the map is a valuable strategic trump card if nuclear weapons and rockets are banned. In respect to its great American rival, the Soviet Union benefits from the protection of two oceans and the Arctic Sea. Striking as they do from a distance, nuclear weapons know no geographical obstacles, and decide operations conducted with conventional weapons, or even rule them out.

Finally, history teaches that in the case when Russia is engaged in a war of attrition, that is, a conflict fought with traditional weapons, winter has proved to be an effective accompaniment to its weapons.

Thus, the fact is that if there were no nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union would be impregnable and would possess all the factors for military superiority over the rest of the world. To a certain degree, the United States would also find itself in an advantageous situation. It, also, has a large population, strong heavy industry, and extends over a vast area, and itself has a geographical position in respect to the New World as favorable as that of the USSR.

These two powers--the United States, by mastering splitting of the atom, and Russia, by producing the first very long-range rockets--played the bad trick on each other of neutralizing the strategic advantages that they enjoyed because of their human and physical geography. Also, would it not be surprising if after having each built the most formidable panoplies of destruction that have ever existed, they came to an agreement--still not without reluctance--to send them to the scrap heap.

If the two powers did proceed with destruction of their stocks of nuclear weapons, they could more easily put an end to the independence of peoples whom fate had less well provided. In Europe, deprived of their nuclear weapons, the American units would no longer have any reason for being, since they would no longer prompt fear of the nuclear thunderbolt. In face of the armed masses--traditionally armed--of the Soviet command, the countries of the European mosaic, considered separately, would have no resort but to come to terms. As for the United States, rejected from Europe and from the world power it has exercised, it would have to settle for being only a regional power.

Also, would Mr Gorbachev's proposals enable an expansionism at low risk, where nuclear strength had previously frozen the borders. And in a quiet way.

The strong approach, used intelligently, was also implicitly cited by Mr Gorbachev. During the coming 5 to 8 years, long-range theater nuclear weapons are to be eliminated. That was also Mr Reagan's objective. Marshal Akhromeev would make a bonfire of his SS 20's, and in the West, General Rogers would consign his Pershings and cruise missiles to the steamroller. And the "zero" option would become a reality. Except that, until the eve of the year 2000, the Soviet Army would keep the SS-21, 22, and 23, rockets that are far more threatening to the conventional forces of the NATO countries. A single salvo of these rockets, which are organically assigned to ground units of the Soviet armies, would be enough to paralyze all organized resistance, though without affecting the population and the economy. Not that the good Mr Gorbachev intends to use the capability he would have to hold the West European countries at his mercy, but the latter would have to adjust their behavior to this new form of subjection.

Washington has given a favorable reception to these proposals as a whole. Why not endorse them, since they are Mr Reagan's proposals? However, there remain some obstacles to overcome before joining in a nuclear disarmament itself--general and complete. Certainly, with a stronger heavy industry, China and its billion people could join Moscow's proposals. India also. But none of the West European countries, certainly not Israel, whose nuclear power protects the vital area, and doubtless also not Japan, which relies on the American guarantee.

If they are aware of the new strategic shift that the still imprecise statements by Reagan and the initiative strongly supported by Mr Gorbachev could introduce, the governments of the countries that American nuclear power has kept outside the coveted areas should remind their powerful ally of its commitments. How can one send to the scrap heap all the weapons that give that guarantee its meaning? As for the middle-rank nuclear powers, indirectly targeted by the Geneva results, they should invoke the safety clause. In order to remain as they are, they have no other alternative than the non-war imposed by intimidation. And how can one intimidate other than by the atom?

The irruption of nuclear weapons onto the international scene created three hierarchies of states. Those that immunize the atom and that, moreover, have

sufficient resources--and freedom--to commit their conventional forces into unstable areas to extend their influence. This means the USSR and, to a much lesser degree, the United States. The second of these three hierarchies is composed of nations that base their security on the nuclear weapons that they possess, but that have in addition neither the resources nor the freedom--with the great powers keeping watch--to intervene in force abroad. That will be the fate of France and the United Kingdom. Finally, the other states depend on their conventional weapons, or threaten to conduct guerrilla operations to discourage the voracity they might encounter, and to fight it if it materializes.

And now the far-in-the-future mastery of space weapons could transform the immunity provided by fear of unacceptable reprisals in a "sanctuarization" based on destruction of offensive weapons, or counterstrike. That is Mr Reagan's feeling. Mr Gorbachev responds by proposing destruction of offensive weapons, which would evidently make pointless the construction of a nuclear shield to defend against them. The proposal of the CPSU general secretary is more stylish than that of the U.S. President. While today mutually exclusive, each proposal could lead to mastery of the world by the most powerful.

To the extent that we might one day regret having so disparaged nuclear weapons. They assure peace between those possessing them, even in unequal quantities, and they limit an all-powerful status for the very "big powers." What would become of the world without this limitation?

9920

CSO: 5200/2717

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

FRG'S KOHL WELCOMES LATEST SOVIET ARMS PROPOSALS

LD251341 Hamburg DPA in German 1219 GMT 25 Jun 86

[Text] Bonn, 25 Jun (DPA) — Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl has appealed to the Soviet Union and the United States to use all the chances for disarmament which have arisen as a result of the most recent proposals made by Moscow. Speaking to the German Society for Foreign Policy, Kohl said in Bonn on Wednesday that a summit meeting between U.S. President Ronald Reagan and Kremlin leader Mikhail Gorbachev this year can still point the way to a reduction of strategic weapons.

Kohl, who spoke in detail about disarmament policy and East-West relations, at the same time expressed the wish for an intensification of German-Soviet relations. In his view, the new Soviet leadership makes possible "internal and external changes."

A fact of particular interest to the West in the new Soviet disarmament proposals, in the view of Kohl, is that Moscow no longer rejects the SDI research program in principle. The Soviet package in the Geneva arms control negotiations is being loosened. Kohl said: "The Soviet Union is indicating a readiness, in connection with the new proposal and on the assumption of the longer-term adherence to the ABM Treaty, to modify its current condition of a ban on specific research for space-based defense systems." This could lead to a definition approaching the restrictive U.S. interpretation of the ABM Treaty.

Kohl expressed his optimism about a summit meeting, taking place this year. That would enable the U.S.-Soviet arms control talks to enter a phase of intensive negotiations. This would strengthen the East-West dialogue as a whole. The Federal Government and the West want an agreement on the global elimination of medium-range weapons with simultaneous consideration of shorter-range systems. The chancellor again called for a worldwide ban on chemical weapons, for a comprehensive test ban treaty and demanded progress in disarmament and arms control in the field of conventional weapons.

/8309

CSO: 5200/2728

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

PRESS NOTES FRG'S KOHL SPEECH ON DISARMAMENT

DW261315 Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network in German 0505 GMT 26 Jun 86

[From the press review]

[Text] Press editorials deal with Chancellor Kohl's speech on disarmament delivered yesterday to the German Society for Foreign Policy.

Westfaelische Nachrichten writes: Helmut Kohl exploited the favorable circumstances. With his speech given to the German Society for Foreign Policy he reacted to what President Reagan had said last week with regard to U.S.-Soviet disarmament efforts. Reagan's carefully uttered preparedness to take new action in the missile field, was followed by mild pressure of the chancellor. He said that Washington and Moscow should exploit all chances offered by the recent Soviet proposals. Obviously, Kohl does not consider these statements as the usual Moscow propaganda, he seems to see acceptable elements in them. If his assessment is correct that the Soviet Union does not basically reject the U.S. SDI research program, a considerable obstacle on the way to progress would have been eliminated.

The Bonn *General-Anzeiger* points out: The conventional disarmament issue gains quickly significance for the Europeans. The dialog between the big powers deals mainly with the stabilization of the strategic balance on a low level. If the problem of nuclear intermediate-range missiles were eliminated, it could turn out quickly that there is a big chance for achieving a breakthrough in the field of conventional armament. The framework conditions were favorable influenced by the CSCE process. Compared with the disarmament report describing the breakthrough as a central instrument for comprehensive peace in Europe, Kohl's statements seem rather cool. Particularly the CSCE process begins to change the attitude of the people in Europe so much that they do not believe in the necessity of excessive military armament to solve their problems.

/8309

CSO: 5200/2728

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

KOHL WELCOMES NEW SOVIET DISARMAMENT INITIATIVES

Possible 'Second Summit' Discussed

LD021522 Hamburg DPA in German 1439 GMT 2 Jul 86

[Text] Bonn, 2 Jul (DPA) — Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl believes that it is "quite remarkable" that the initiatives for positive disarmament proposals have come from Moscow this time. In an interview on the first German television network he said this evening that "a great deal has started to move" between the two superpowers.

Kohl said on the "Focus" program that he expects a new Soviet-U.S. summit conference either in the autumn "or in early winter," this time in Washington. In his view the chances for a disarmament agreement are probably greatest in the sphere of chemical weapons. But reductions in conventional arms and the dismantling of medium-range missiles are also urgent, particularly for the Germans. Kohl also spoke in support of agreements between the two superpowers on SDI research.

Also taking part in the television debate were Kenneth Adelman, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and Valentin Falin, director of the Soviet news agency and former ambassador in Bonn.

Feller Interviews Kohl

DW031015 Hamburg ARD Television Network in German 2005 GMT 2 Jul 86

[Interview with Chancellor Helmut Kohl by correspondent Wolf Feller in Bonn on the "Brennpunkt" program; date not given--recorded]

[Text][Feller] Mr Chancellor, more and more signs indicate in Washington and in Moscow that there could be a second summit meeting this year between Soviet party chief Gorbachev and U.S. President Reagan. How do you assess the chances of disarmament negotiations?

[Kohl] I am all for such a meeting. As you know, I have always advocated such a meeting after the last one in Geneva, because I think it is right and correct that the two most important political leaders of the East and the West should know each other personally, speak to each other, although naturally they cannot resolve the problems in a first talk. However, a great deal has started to

move now. Mr Feller, if you look back for 2 years — this must be always said if one becomes impatient, and I admit that I am also impatient — it was hardly believable that such proposals, as submitted by Moscow and Washington, would be discussed, although the proposals are not yet satisfactory, I want to add.

[Feller] This time the initiatives came from Moscow.

[Kohl] Yes, I think this is remarkable. What I do not like about the matter, or what is not particularly useful, is the fact that too many of these proposals have been openly made with too much propaganda. I am not in favor of secret diplomacy, but in disarmament and detente policy one can advance only if one has so much mutual confidence that one can talk to each other confidentially.

Signs of the time indicate that the meeting between Gorbachev and Reagan will take place either in the autumn or in early winter in Washington. I think that in the very near future the foreign ministers of the two countries will begin most significant talks. I only hope that this will not be accompanied by a public exchange of blows, but that one will quickly begin to talk business. We need this talks between the two because this will open the chance to talk business in Geneva.

[Feller] What would be the main points in your opinion? Reduction of intermediate-range missiles in Europe, or dismantling of conventional weapons?

[Kohl] I believe that the whole thing will work only if one will be able to deal with everything and not with just one sector. We as the German element are interested in the dismantling of conventional weapons. We carry some of the main NATO burden in this respect. We are interested in real disarmament in the field of intermediate-range weapons, naturally in a controlled way maintaining the balance. Most of all, I am interested in the sphere of chemical weapons. We have a clear agreement with our American friends in this matter. I think, and my feelings indicate, that something could most likely be achieved in this sphere. I do not care about the succession, Mr Feller, if only there will be some movement at all. I think it should be possible to come to an agreement with a view to SDI research work in the United States and similar although older, research work in the Soviet Union, an agreement restricting [festschreiben] research work in the ABM framework and the ABM Treaty as such for a fixed time.

In short, I think it is most important to start negotiations at the time when the current U.S. President is in office. He is also domestically a politically a strong president, and only a strong U.S. president will have the backing for such negotiations in with in the nation.

[Feller] On the other side Gorbachev is under pressure.

[Kohl] Yes, but he is just at the beginning of a way, so to speak. He became general secretary very recently. I find that the personnel situation is quite favorable, aside from all propaganda, if something like that can be favorable at all.

[Feller] Mr Chancellor, in power conflicts between states or groups of states one can achieve as much with disarmament as with rearmament. One can take military options from the adversary and safeguard own advantages. How do you assess the position of NATO and that of the NATO allies?

[Kohl] I think that these negotiations must be held without any illusions at all. Those people who say here that we will disarm unilaterally are dreamers. In fact, they are even dangerous fools, because the consequence would inevitably be that the so-called neutrality would drive us into the Soviet hegemony. What we need is basic confidence. It is very difficult to achieve it between two blocs that are so different ideologically, between liberal democracies and communists dictatorships. This must be viewed completely without illusions. However, one can certainly assume that the people in power in Moscow are realistic. We in the West are also realistic. We know from a realistic point of view that there is no alternative to negotiations. Gorbachev and Reagan both have pointed that out in the Geneva communique. Negotiations are necessary and, therefore, the West must enter these negotiations with a firm NATO. In other words, NATO in a state of disintegration, as some people here in our country wish, would be a catastrophe. We will achieve reasonable agreements with the Soviet Union only if NATO will be able to guarantee peace and freedom in our country.

/8309

CSO: 5200/2728

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

SOVIET ARMS NEGOTIATORS IN BONN FOR TALKS

Preview on Talks

LD061034 Hamburg DPA in German 1017 GMT 6 Jul 86

[Text] Bonn, 6 Jul (DPA) — The Soviet chief negotiator at the Geneva disarmament negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union, Viktor Karpov, is coming to Bonn on Monday. This has been confirmed by Ambassador Friedrich Ruth, who is to hold talks with Karpov as the Federal Government's representative on questions connected with disarmament and arms control. All arms control topics at the various negotiating levels are to be touched on at the meeting.

Karpov is also to meet the state secretary at the Foreign Ministry, Andreas Meyer-Landrut. On Wednesday the Soviet expert on the chemical weapons negotiations in Geneva, Israelyan, is also expected in Bonn. The chief negotiator at the negotiations on strategic weapons, Ronald Lehman, is coming to Bonn from Washington on Tuesday. The visits are part of the regular contacts between the Federal Government and the superpowers on disarmament questions.

Genscher Meets USSR's Karpov

LD071501 Hamburg DPA in German 1443 GMT 7 Jul 86

[Text] Bonn, 7 Jul (DPA) — Viktor Karpov, the Soviet head of delegation at the Soviet-U.S. disarmament negotiations in Geneva, was received for a talk in Bonn on Monday by Federal Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher (FDP). Karpov is in the federal capital for consultations with Friedrich Ruth, the disarmament representative of the Federal Government.

According to the Foreign Ministry, Genscher said that the Federal Government intended to do everything to promote the negotiations at the various levels. Genscher also underlined the Federal Government's interest in a summit meeting between U.S. President Ronald Reagan and the Soviet party leader Mikhail Gorbachev, which would have to yield substantial results.

Karpov on Summit 'Preconditions'

LD071937 Hamburg DPA in German 1809 GMT 7 Jul 86

[Excerpt] Bonn, 7 Jul (DPA)— Viktor Karpov, head of the Soviet delegation to the U.S.-USSR disarmament negotiations in Geneva, today in Bonn stated the preconditions for a new summit meeting between U.S. President Ronald Reagan and CPSU chief Mikhail Gorbachev. The prerequisites are a positive atmosphere in U.S.-Soviet relations and a guarantee that there will be practical results regarding one or two issues of space or nuclear arms, Karpov said at a press conference in the Soviet Embassy. These could also include a readiness by the United States to dispense with nuclear weapons tests, following the example of the Soviet Union.

Karpov, who has for some time also been the head of the department for arms control issues in the USSR Foreign Ministry, was in Bonn for disarmament policy consultations at the invitation of the Federal Government. There he met with Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher and representatives of the FRG Foreign and Defense Ministries. The talks also served as preparation for Genscher's planned visit to Moscow on 20 July.

Karpov said he is "not wholly satisfied" with the results of his consultations. In the Soviet view, the Federal Government's positions at the Stockholm disarmament conference and at the Vienna negotiations on troop reductions (MBFR) are not helpful. Bonn is further complicating U.S.-Soviet negotiations on medium-range weapons with additional demands, Karpov said. However, Karpov expressed confidence that the Geneva negotiations on a worldwide ban on chemical weapons will be successfully concluded this year.

/8309

CSO: 5200/2728

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

PRC: 'NEW TRENDS' IN U.S.-USSR DISARMAMENT ISSUE

HK230913 Beijing GUANGMING RIBAO in Chinese 15 Jul 86 p 4

[Article by Zheng Dexin "New Trends in the Issue of U.S. - USSR Disarmament"]

[Excerpts] Recently, there have been some noteworthy new trends in the issue of U.S. - USSR disarmament.

After President Reagan announced on 27 May that the United States would cease to comply with the SALT II accord later this year, the Soviet Union, on the one hand, carried out vehement criticism, declaring that it would adopt "corresponding measures": on the other hand, it continued to put forth disarmament programs and proposals. As soon as the fifth round of U.S. -USSR disarmament talks in Geneva ended, the USSR suggested that the U.S. and the USSR hold "special arms talks" in Geneva in July (according to the rules, the sixth round of the Geneva disarmament talks should be held in mid-September to discuss the question of Reagan's proposing to dissolve the second Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty. Not long ago, Gorbachev also indicated that the Soviet Union is prepared to make some compromises on the issue of medium-range missiles. Most noteworthy is the "middle program" which the USSR put forward in mid-June. Two days after Reagan announced that the United States would "abrogate the treaty" the head of the Soviet delegation to the Geneva disarmaments talks, Karpov, privately revealed the essence of the programme to the American representatives. Two weeks later, the details of this program were published, with Gorbachev officially proposing them to Reagan. [passage omitted]

Once the Soviet program was proposed, President Reagan immediately indicated that he "felt encouraged" by the program. In a speech in Glassboro, he said that this is "the beginning of serious Soviet efforts to reduce nuclear weapons," that "it could become the turning point in U.S. - USSR negotiations." He also indicated that the U.S. could "accept the proposals in principle." This positive response by Reagan to the Soviet disarmament program has also been noted by world public opinion.

Will the "turning point" that Reagan spoke of appear in the U.S.-USSR disarmament negotiations? According to analysis, the reason for the USSR's suggesting such a program and the U.S. making such a positive response is, aside from both sides wanting to earn public support, they each have plans of their own. First of all, the above-mentioned flexibility demonstrated by the Soviet Union in the new program does not mean that it has changed its basic position of opposition to the "star wars" plan. After Reagan had announced that the United States would cease to observe the SALT II agreement, the Soviet Union was very worried that the "Anti-Ballistic Missiles Treaty" concluded in 1972 would be similarly abrogated, especially since this treaty never did have a definite deadline. The basic objective of the new Soviet proposal is to use the

"Anti-Ballistic Missiles Treaty" to restrict U.S. development of "star wars" plans, not let the U.S. get ahead in deploying space weapons, and, in the process, gain time to develop its own space weapons. Conversely, once the above-mentioned treaty is dissolved, the United States would have a freer hand to develop its "star wars" plans and this could further intensify the arms race. For the Soviet Union, whose economic and technical strength is not equal to that of the U.S. and which is currently exerting great efforts to revitalize the national economy, this could be very unfavorable. As for reducing strategic weapons, the USSR believes that excessive pursuit of numbers in strategic arms has not real significance. The new program suggests maintaining "parity" with the U.S., which also means not letting the U.S. hold unilateral superiority.

The main reason the U.S. made a positive evaluation of the Soviet program was the fact that the USSR no longer requires the U.S. to abandon the "star wars" plans and no longer insists that the abandoning of space arms to be the prerequisite for a reduction in strategic arms. This accords with consistent proposals of the U.S. Moreover, Reagan's "treaty abrogation" announcement met with criticism by the opposition at home and objections by Western allies. Reagan's positive response to the USSR program showed that the U.S. is willing to maintain dialogue with the USSR and favors appeasing the dissatisfaction of opposition groups at home and of its allies.

At present, it appears that U.S.-USSR arguments around the "middle program" will still focus on the "star wars" plans. According to foreign wire reports, while affirming the new USSR program, Reagan also added that "it is not possible to accept the proposals intact." In a speech on television on 12 July, Reagan reiterated that the U.S. "star wars" plans are not "a bargaining chip" in the U.S.-USSR disarmament talks. It seems that there remain differences within the U.S. Government as to whether to use delayed implementation of the "star wars" plans as bargaining counter with the USSR. [passage omitted]

1986 is the International Year of Peace. As such, the international community hopes that the two countries with the greatest number of nuclear weapons, that is, the United States and the USSR, will assume responsibility for global peace and world security, and that on the question of disarmament, they will no longer carry out "program wars" and propaganda wars and, instead, end the lengthy stagnant situation and truly achieve real progress.

/12858

CSO: 5200/4058

SALT/START ISSUES

CANADIAN EDITORIAL CALLS REAGAN STANCE ON SALT 'CONFUSING'

Vancouver THE SUN in English 16 Jun 86 p B4

[Text]

President Ronald Reagan's game of pass-the-SALT is completely confusing and also frightening.

No one can be sure any more whether the president will honor the strategic arms limitation agreement of 1979. His own statements in the past few days have implied that he will and that he won't.

Perhaps he does not realize how the world hangs on to his every word. It wants to know the meaning of what he says and if the meaning isn't clear, it can only worry. When it comes to nuclear weapons, ignorance is fright.

Mr. Reagan has been playing his game since he first ran for the presidency in 1980. He always said the unratified SALT II agreement was "fundamentally flawed." But in office he honored it. He has been trying to please ideologues in his administration as well as public opinion. Now he has got into a terrible tangle.

Mr. Reagan announced last month that the United States would abandon SALT II. But at a press conference last week he softened his stand, saying that SALT II would live on if the Soviet Union made progress in continuing arms control negotiations. He also made a firm commitment to a summit meeting and threw in gratuitous praise for Mikhail Gorbachev, saying he is the first Soviet leader he knows of who has voluntarily proposed nuclear arms reductions.

The next day, however, Mr. Reagan's press spokesman announced that SALT II was dead. Mr. Reagan himself fudged when asked if this was true.

These statements follow several new proposals originating with the Soviets: for reduction of long-range strategic missiles, for a space pact, and for a cut in Warsaw Pact troops in Europe. These deserve serious consideration because there are only so many offers that can be refused before the whole arms negotiating process collapses, as it has threatened to do throughout the Reagan presidency.

Mr. Reagan underestimates the effect of his words. But members of the Congress don't and urge him to comply with SALT II, as allies such as Canada surely must agree.

SALT/START ISSUES

PRC JOURNAL VIEWS REAGAN ANNOUNCEMENT TO ABANDON SALT II

HK180937 Beijing SHIJIE ZHISHI in Chinese No 13, 1 Jul 86 pp 5-6

[Article by Han Bin and Zhuang Maocheng: "A Signal of an Intensified Nuclear Arms Race"]

[Excerpts] Just when people are very concerned and puzzled about the fact that the U.S.-Soviet arms control negotiations in Geneva are at a standstill, on 27 May, U.S. President Ronald Reagan announced that the United States would no longer be limited by the SALT II Arms Treaty with the Soviet Union. His lengthy announcement has cast a new shadow on the U.S.-Soviet Geneva talks. This is a dangerous signal that the United States and the Soviet Union may further intensify their nuclear arms race.

Reagan's announcement said in its denunciation that "Soviet violations had seriously damaged the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty," and declared that under such circumstances, the United States "would decide on the structure of its strategic forces in accordance with the nature and degree of the threat by the Soviet strategic forces," and "not on the basis of the SALT II Treaty." On the one hand, the announcement said that after the eighth U.S. Trident missile submarine starts its term of service this year, the United States will still dismantle another Neptune submarine in order to comply with the limits of the treaty; but on the other hand, it also said that the United States will equip its 131st B-52 bomber with cruise missiles by the end of this year regardless of the limits of the treaty. A senior official of the Reagan administration said that U.S. decision is imperative unless the Soviet Union obviously changes its attitude in the next few months.

The SALT II agreement was signed by Brezhnev and Carter in Vienna in June 1979.

From the wording of Reagan's announcement, it can be explained that the U.S. abandonment of SALT II is because the "treaty has deficiencies" and "it has not been officially ratified by the Congress," and even if it were ratified, it expired at the end of last year, and constant Soviet violations of the agreement seriously imperiled U.S. interests and security. However, observers have pointed out that Reagan's decision also conceals some other objectives.

First, this is an important step taken by the United States to further enhance its military strength in order to have a preponderance of strength over the Soviet Union in the arms race. The Reagan administration knows that a number of treaties and agreements have been signed since the United States and the Soviet Union started negotiations on nuclear arms control in 1969, but the Soviet Union has not been really limited by them. The momentum of Soviet arms expansion has not been even slightly

contained. Soviet strategic weaponry has surpassed that of the United States quantitatively and qualitatively and its land-based ballistic missiles have long predominated.

Second, the announcement also intends to exert pressure on the Soviet Union and force it to make compromises in the Geneva disarmament talks. Since the talks resumed in March 1985, the two countries have been entangled in an incessant "war of proposals" on arms control and the stand of both parties on the question is being riven farther and farther from each other. No substantial progress has been so far achieved even though five rounds of talks have been held. [paragraph continues]

The second summit meeting of the two leaders scheduled to be held in the United States this year, which was proposed by them during their first meeting in November last year, seems to be uncertain because many new problems cropped up between the two countries. According to the press of foreign countries, Reagan's strongly worded announcement is aimed at bargaining with the Soviet Union so that the Geneva disarmament talks will achieve some progress in favor of the United States and the second U.S.-Soviet summit will be held as early as possible.

Third, Reagan's decision was made to assist in uniting the struggle at home. On the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty, there have long been different views in the United States. As early as when President Reagan assumed office in the White House, he disagreed with the treaty, but he did not take any action to abandon the treaty only out of consideration for the views of the NATO allies and the moderates at home. In recent years the conservative forces in the United States have markedly increased and their voice for breaking the bounds of the treaty is becoming louder and louder. In addition, the mid-term election of the Congress will start soon. Under such circumstances, Reagan determinedly made the decision by the "advice" of his hardline advisers in order to win the support of the ever-growing conservative forces so as to strive for more Republican seats in the Congress. Moreover, Reagan's decision will also influence the congressional debate on the 1987 defense budget and mow down the opposition of congressmen who call for less military expenditures by making use of the treaty, thus guaranteeing the smooth implementation of the development plan of strategic weaponry. Some people therefore said that Reagan's announcement was a victory of the faction which favors a tough policy toward the Soviet Union, represented by the defense department. What they said is perhaps quite reasonable.

Reagan's announcement has evoked strong repercussions throughout the world. The Soviet Government issued a statement on 31 May, denouncing the United States for "opening the sluice to carry out an unrestricted arms race. The statement also warned the United States "against any illusion" and said the Soviet Union "would not be indifferent" to U.S. violations of the treaty and would certainly "adopt the necessary measures" to maintain a strategic balance. At a press conference on 4 June, general staff chief of the Soviet Armed Forces, Akhromeyev, accused the United States of trying to "make the Soviet Union exhausted" by means of large-scale arms race, but he said that "the Soviet Union would find effective countermeasures" against the challenge. Soviet official statements and newspaper commentaries as well all hinted that Reagan's decision might force the Soviet Union to cancel the summit meeting of the two countries scheduled to be held this year. The reaction of some U.S. allies was also very strong. At the foreign minister's meeting of the NATO nations held from 29 to 30 May, U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz "was extremely isolated" and was criticized by participants with one voice. The meeting focused on discussing Reagan's announcement, but the issue was purposely not mentioned in its communique because of a sharp difference of views. At a press conference after the meeting, some foreign ministers said Reagan "unilaterally

made the U.S. decision on the eve of the meeting" and the allies hoped it was not Reagan's "final decision." Opposition factions in the United States also made charges against the decision, describing it as a "very dangerous move." They worried that Reagan's decision may force the Soviet Union to speed up its development of its nuclear arsenal and this will be more harmful to the United States. People in many regions of the world also worry about a possible escalation of the nuclear arms race between the two superpowers. As this year is the International Peace Year in the world, what people hope for is that the United States and the Soviet Union, which possess the majority of nuclear weapons in the world, will take poitive action to stop the arms race and take the lead in substantially cutting down their nuclear arsenals. They should assume due responsibility for world peace and security of all countries and should not run counter to this.

/12858

CSO: 5200/4056

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

IZVESTIYA CITES KYODO ON U.S. DEPLOYMENTS IN EUROPE, ASIA

PM171151 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Jul 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent S. Agafonov report: "A Course Toward Superiority"]

[Text] Tokyo -- That is how the Japanese press assesses of the Pentagon plans, which have become public, to begin construction of nuclear weapon stores on the territory of eight allied countries.

According to reports which have leaked to the press about secret hearings in an American congressional subcommittee, new storehouses for nuclear munitions will be constructed in the FRG, Turkey, Britain, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, Greece, and South Korea.

As the KYODO agency writes, in all 415 underground nuclear stores will be built, including 144 in the FRG, 128 in Britain, and 36 in South Korea.

The Pentagon, the agency notes, has set a course of building up its nuclear potential outside American territory within the framework of the implementation of the new military strategy, directed against the USSR.

Its basic elements are the strengthening of the offensive might of air and naval forces as close as possible to the Soviet borders. The Japanese mass media particularly stress the Far East aspect of Washington's strategy.

Equipping the ships of the U.S. 7th Fleet with Tomahawk missiles, deploying F-16 fighter-bombers which carry nuclear weapons in South Korea and Japan, and modernizing carrier-borne aircraft is now to be supplemented by the nuclear dumps.

KYODO points out: Although Japanese territory does not figure on the Pentagon's "list of dumps," its role as a strategic bridgehead for American aircraft actions in the Far East is growing.

The dangerous nature of the Pentagon's desire to achieve military superiority is obvious, as is Washington's reluctance to adopt a serious, responsible approach to questions of lessening international tension. The United States responds to the Soviet nuclear test moratorium with explosions in Nevada; the U.S. response to the USSR's proposals to eliminate nuclear weapons is to develop new systems of such weapons; and to build new storehouses for them.

It seems that the United States takes only one thing seriously -- the exacerbation of tension and the undermining of any attempts to take the world away from the fatal brink.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1482

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

SOVIET DISARMAMENT EXPERT ON CHEMICAL WEAPONS

LD101827 Hamburg DPA in German 1720 GMT 10 Jul 86

[Excerpt] Bonn, 10 Jul (DPA) -- The head of the Soviet delegation at the international disarmament conference in Geneva, Viktor Israelyan, expressed skepticism in Bonn today about the chances of an accord on a worldwide ban on chemical weapons being agreed at the conference this year. Technically this would not be a problem, he said at a press conference in the Soviet Embassy, but there was a lack of will on the part of the United States.

At the invitation of the FRG, the Soviet disarmament expert held talks with Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher who expressed optimism about achieving a chemical weapons agreement this year.

According to the Foreign Affairs Ministry, in the talk with Israelyan he reiterated that the FRG wants to continue working vigorously for the early completion of such an accord. Genscher appealed to the Soviet Union to contribute to an early conclusion to the negotiations through flexibility in the questions that are still open, especially the problem of verification.

At the press conference, Israelyan accused the United States of preventing a settlement by making extreme demands in the question of verification. Washington's position was not shared by the neutrals and the West European states. He said he does not have the impression that the U.S. Administration is interested in an agreement. Furthermore, the negotiations would be complicated and undermined if Washington were to realize its plans to produce binary chemical weapons, which constitute "a new generation of weapons." Israelyan said that Genscher, on the other hand, has reaffirmed his interest in speeding up the Geneva negotiations.

Israelyan's visit continues the Federal Government's consultations with disarmament experts of the two superpowers. [passage omitted]

/8309

CSO: 5200/2728

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

FRG'S SPD DISARMAMENT EXPERT DISCUSSES CHEMICAL WEAPONS

LD111036 Hamburg DPA in German 0301 GMT 11 Jul 86

[Text] Bonn, 11 Jul (DPA)—SPD disarmament expert Hermann Scheer wants a parliamentary investigation of the possibilities for objection that have been allowed to the Federal Government in connection with the possible deployment of new U.S. poison weapons. In an interview with the DPA, Scheer, who is the representative of the SPD parliamentary party in the subcommittee for disarmament and arms control, emphasized his mistrust about the extent of the veto President Ronald Reagan granted to Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl at the beginning of May.

Scheer said that in the event of a hearing in the Bundestag, U.S. congressmen who had so far opposed the Pentagon's demands to start producing new chemical weapons would have to be invited. At this hearing the mutually obstructive demands by Moscow and Washington for verification possibilities must also be discussed.

Scheer pointed to the statements by Soviet chief delegate Viktor Israelyan who, speaking to journalists in Bonn yesterday, expressly dampened the hopes of Federal Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher for a chemical weapons agreement this year. The Soviet diplomat blamed extreme U.S. demands. Scheer said that the far-reaching Soviet proclamations of concessions have also not reached the negotiating table so far.

/8309

CSO: 5200/2728

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

BRIEFS

U.S.-SOVIET CONSULTATIONS CLOSE--Geneva, 18 July (TASS)--Soviet-American consultations on all aspects of the problem of an effective and verifiable international convention on general and complete ban on the chemical weapons has closed here today. The USSR delegation was led by Ambassador Viktor Israelyan, the U.S. delegation--by Ambassador David Lowitz. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1351 GMT 18 Jul 86 LD] /12858

CSO: 5200/1485

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

SOVIET REPORTAGE ON END OF CDE SESSION IN STOCKHOLM

Grinevskiy Comments Noted

LD222147 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1918 GMT 18 Jul 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Vitaliy Ilyashenko]

[Text] A regular session of the Conference on Confidence-and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe closed in Stockholm today. Addressing the closing session, Grinevskiy, head of the Soviet delegation, said that in the past few days the conference has succeeded in unraveling one of the problems that had long prevented progress, the problem of notification about air force exercises.

A common basis is also envisaged on the question of ground troop exercises.

Reaching an essential agreement in Stockholm, the Soviet representative noted, is possible only on the basis of a compromise. As CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Gorbachev stated, it is high time that all participants display responsibility and flexibility. Only serious reciprocal concessions on the basis of equality and equal security can ensure success. Goodwill on the part of all participants in the conference is needed for that, of course. Unfortunately, some delegations are in no hurry as yet to display it.

Progress Analyzed

LD182258 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 18 Jul 86

[Text] The latest session of the Conference on Confidence-and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe ended in Stockholm today. The present session was the penultimate in the forum's work. Although it ended today, many delegates have remained here in Stockholm in order to continue unofficial meetings and consultations, that is to say to use to the full the time up until the end of the conference. During the session progress has been made in a number of important spheres.

In particular, the problem of notification of air force exercises has at last been resolved. At the same time, the session showed that the conference participants do not have many obstacles to overcome before the signing a final document. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries have done a great deal to tie up such key issues as notification, exchange of annual plans for military activities, invitations to observers, nonuse of force, verification, and monitoring.

Unfortunately, the NATO countries are not backing up their words sufficiently with concrete actions.

Speaking at the plenary session today, Comrade Grinevskiy, special envoy and head of the Soviet delegation, pointed out that mutual concessions are the only way to achieve vital agreement; only serious mutual concessions on the basis of equality and security can yield a positive result. There is very little time left before the day the conference ends, 19 September. Unless its work is stepped up now, even if there is goodwill, time could run out.

Meanwhile everyone is expecting that at Stockholm there will nonetheless be success in coming to an agreement on substantial confidence building and security measures. Then favorable preconditions would be created for the all-European meeting this fall in Vienna, the second stage of the Stockholm conference, which would be able to work productively on matters relating to disarmament.

'Breakthrough' On Air Notification

LD181234 Moscow TASS in English 1223 GMT 18 Jul 86

[Text] Stockholm July 18 TASS -- By TASS correspondent Nikolay Vukolov

The Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe closed its session in the Swedish capital today. Addressing the closing sitting, Oleg Grinevskiy, head of the Soviet delegation, said that a major breakthrough was achieved at the conference over the past days. One of the biggest difficulties that for long stood in the way of advancement -- the problem of notification about air force exercises -- was untangled.

The socialist countries have always favoured notification about all major exercises involving the air force -- the strike branch of the armed services. The NATO countries, however, rejected altogether the idea of notification about air force exercises. A keen struggle was long under way at the conference between these two diametrically opposite views of the sides. A compromise was found on the basis of establishing air force sublevel within the framework of the notification about exercises of ground troops, starting from which important information on air force exercises would be provided. Many countries were engaged in the search for the compromise. According to experts, the agreement covered practically 90 percent of the entire air force activity in Europe, including that considered most dangerous from the viewpoint of a sudden attack. A substantial common basis also became visible on the question of ground troops exercises, said the Soviet representative. It was agreed in the past days that notification should cover the exercises of the ground troops conducted jointly with elements of the air force, navy amphibious and air-borne troops. It remained to agree on the parameters of notification. The socialist countries met halfway the wishes of many nations -- NATO, and neutral ones -- that the threshold of notification be lowered, by suggesting that they cover the exercises involving 18,000 men.

The NATO countries expressed their readiness to raise the numerical level of notification, but no concrete proposals as yet followed. With a view to finding mutually acceptable solutions in restricting the scale of military exercises, the socialist countries expressed their readiness to take as a basis the proposals advanced by the neutral and the non-aligned nations. These proposals were making it possible to curb the scope of military exercises in Europe, which, as the example of some NATO exercises showed, were sometimes hard to distinguish from the deployment of troops for starting armed actions. The verification problem, Grinevskiy said, was of prime importance for the socialist countries. "We want to be firmly convinced that the agreements we conclude are

strictly complied with by all. That is why we insist that agreements on confidence-building measures be secured by effective and adequate verification." Relying on the proposals advanced in Budapest, the socialist countries were ready to endorse an agreement to the effect that the participating states conduct on-site inspections over confidence-building measures in the process of monitoring the reduction of the armed forces and conventional armaments. It was also necessary to bring to the end the elaboration of the agreement that would specify and impart effectiveness to the principle of non-use of force.

Reaching an essential agreement in Stockholm, the Soviet representative concluded, would be possible only on the basis of compromise. Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said that "it is high time that all participants in the conference display responsibility and flexibility. Only serious reciprocal concessions on the basis of equality and equal security can ensure success." Needed for that, naturally, was the goodwill on the part of all participants in the conference. Some delegations, regrettably, were in no hurry so far to display it.

European Situation Seen Favorable

LD192039 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 CMT 19 Jul 86

[Aleksandr Zholkver commentary]

[Text] As we have already reported, the latest session of the conference on Confidence and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe has ended in Stockholm. Here with a Mayak commentary is our political observer Aleksandr Zholkver at the microphone:

The work of the Stockholm conference is entering a decisive phase. One more session remains; it is planned for mid-August to mid-September, and then the forum in the Swedish capital will hand over to the Vienna meeting of representatives of the states participating in the all-European conference. Thus, the process of development will be continued; the start made at the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe should be preserved. Of course, this process is neither simple nor easy, if one considers that powerful military groups and accumulated mountains of weapons are confronting each other in Europe.

The long years of cold war have implanted many prejudices and a lot of suspicion in interrelations between the European states. This was reflected at the Stockholm conference that has already been working for 2 and 1/2 years, and all the problems concerned with strengthening mutual confidence have still not been solved. Yet, the necessity for a new political way of thinking is evidently making headway.

An important breakthrough has been made in the last few days at the Stockholm conference. One of the tight knots has been unravelled -- the problem concerning the notification of air force exercises. An accord on ground troop exercises has also been outlined.

The general situation that has been unfolding recently on the European Continent also played a significant role in the achievement of all these accords. The Europeans are evidently fed up with the commotion of confrontation and tension and they are speaking out ever more loudly in favor of the politics of detente.

During a recent visit to Moscow, the president of France said that Europe must once again become the main actor in its own history in order to play its full role as a factor of stability in international relations.

During Comrade Shevardnadze's stay in London, the British minister of foreign affairs emphasized that the present moment demands resolute efforts in the area of arms limitation. His West German colleague, who is preparing to visit Moscow in the next few days, points to the European task of guaranteeing peace.

As far as the socialist European countries are concerned, as is known, their leaders not only confirmed their striving toward strengthening peace and security on the European Continent at the recent meeting in Budapest, but also introduced concrete proposals on arms reduction in Europe, and on arranging broad, mutually advantageous cooperation between all European states.

U.S. Delegate Cited

PM221540 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Jul 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent A. Sychev dispatch under the "Stockholm Conference" rubric: "Positive Decision Possible"]

[Text] Stockholm -- The present session of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, which has just completed its work, has undoubtedly been of special significance.

This 11th session since the onset of the talks brings the Stockholm forum, as it were, into the finishing straight, the first stage of the conference ends on 19 September.

The session that just ended took place against a background of major international events that have determined the world's political climate. These were principally the Soviet-French summit talks in Moscow and the Soviet-British talks in London, which particularly discussed European security questions. The spirit and results of the talks were not slow to have an effect here, giving the conference a fresh boost.

Assessing the results of the session, American delegation leader R. Barry acknowledged that "substantial progress [sushchestvennyy progres] has been made at the conference. It can be said that the framework of an agreement has appeared, and this inspires cautious optimism."

"It has been a very difficult and delicate session. Only at the very end of the work was progress -- progress I think can be rated as considerable [znachitelnyy] -- apparent," was the impression of Ambassador W. Konarski, leader of the Polish delegation. "The socialist states made a substantial contribution to that progress."

The session saw the beginnings of a solution to problems in such areas of the talks as the exchange of annual plans for military activity, the invitation of observers, and the nonuse of force, which made it possible for the conference participants to move forward.

It is well known that the question of notification of air force exercises had been the stumbling block at the previous session. It has now proved possible to break that deadlock.

A considerable common basis is also discernible in the issue of exercises involving ground troops. In the last few days an accord has been reached ensuring that notification extends to exercises of ground troops carried out in conjunction with components of the air force, navy, and amphibious and airborne troops.

It has to be noted, however, that the forum is still faced with many unresolved problems associated with the stand taken by the NATO countries, whose words are inadequately backed up by deeds. The situation prevailing in the working party concerned with limiting the scale of military activity is causing disquiet. It is still having to contend with opposition from the NATO countries, which are using "special security interests" as a cover for essentially trying to retain the possibility of holding large-scale military maneuvers in Europe. There would thus be maintained a source of mistrust and tension in interstate relations.

I recall a question put by a Western journalist during a recent press conference: "Who is giving more -- East or West -- and who is getting more out of the Stockholm conference?" The erroneousness of such an approach is obvious: "Only serious mutual concessions on the basis of equality and identical security can ensure success," M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said during his speech at a banquet in honor of French President F. Mitterrand.

The socialist states have, in fact, repeatedly demonstrated their will to meet their partners halfway. At the concluded session they again submitted a number of proposals aimed at finding compromises. In the sphere of limiting the scale of military exercises and the nonuse of force in international relations they expressed their readiness to adopt proposals submitted by the neutral and nonaligned countries as a basis for negotiation. Moreover, they agreed to incorporate an accord on on-site inspection to ensure observance of confidence-building measures within the process of monitoring the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments.

"We hope that the initiatives proposed by us will help achieve a substantial agreement in the time remaining," Soviet delegation leader O.A. Grinevskiy said. "Success in Stockholm is a key link which, once grasped, is capable of setting in motion a whole chain of talks and of resolving urgent international matters. This would also create favorable conditions for the second stage of the conference, during which the participants will be concerned with disarmament questions."

The Stockholm conference session has completed its work. Time is very short, and to make the maximum use of that remaining many delegations have resolved to spend part of the recess in Stockholm to continue unofficial consultations.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1483

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

USSR: PACT, NATO ATTITUDES ON EUROPEAN ARMS CUTS CONTRASTED

PM231152 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Jul 86 Second Edition p 3

[Colonel V. Olgin article: "Two Approaches: On the Positions of the Warsaw Pact States and the NATO Countries on Questions of Disarmament"]

[Text] The struggle for the preservation and strengthening of universal peace and against the nuclear threat and the arms race was and is the main avenue of the Soviet Union's foreign policy activity. The Soviet state backs up its desire to strengthen peace and security with practical actions. These are incorporated in the concrete, realistic program for the total elimination of nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction by the end of this century. This program is widely supported by the world public. People of goodwill are convinced that if the United States were to join in the Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests and adopt a number of other Soviet proposals, this would be significant progress toward the creation of a secure peace for the people of the earth.

One decisive avenue in the struggle to avert the threat of war is to decrease the level of military confrontation on the European Continent. On this important question, a weighty addition to the Soviet program for the elimination of weapons of mass destruction was the new initiative put forward at the Budapest conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee. It is a question of reducing armed forces and conventional arms in Europe. They propose a reduction in all components of the ground forces and tactical strike aviation of the European states, and also in the corresponding forces and resources of the United States and Canada stationed in Europe. Simultaneously, there would also be a conventional arms reduction in operational-tactical nuclear arms with a range (radius) of up to 1,000 km.

The proposed reductions would take place on the whole territory of Europe -- from the Atlantic to the Urals -- in accordance with an agreed procedure and with military equilibrium being constantly maintained at lower levels without detriment to anyone's security. Reliable, effective verification is envisaged both of the actual process of reduction, and of the military activity of the troops remaining after the reduction. The socialist countries' proposals take account of the Western side's wishes. They do not make any preliminary conditions, on the contrary, express the readiness to examine, in a constructive spirit, any counterproposals by the NATO states, the neutral and nonaligned countries, and other European countries. These proposals destroy the speculative argument that nuclear disarmament in Europe, if the present level of conventional arms was maintained, would place the West European states at a disadvantage.

The socialist countries are flexible in their approach to the machinery of talks on this problem, believing that a number of forums could be used for this purpose. The proposals could be the subject of concrete discussion at the second state of the Conference on Confidence-and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. It would also be possible to convene a special forum for this purpose, consisting of the European states, the United States, and Canada. They are also prepared to extend the framework of the Vienna talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe by bringing in other European states and changing the mandate.

An end to nuclear tests, the total elimination of Soviet and American medium-range missiles in the European zone, the attainment of concrete accords on other questions at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms, the elimination this century of chemical weapons and the industrial base for their manufacture, a substantial reduction in armed forces and conventional arms at global and regional levels, and the implementation of effective verification in all spheres and at all stages of arms reduction and disarmament -- these are the main directions in which the socialist community states express readiness for the broadest cooperation and talks with the NATO bloc states and other countries.

As for the West's position, its approach to these very important problems can be judged by the results of the recent NATO Council session in Halifax (Canada). What was discussed, what decisions were adopted at the session of the North Atlantic Bloc Council and its working organs?

It was again confirmed that nuclear weapons are an integral component of NATO strategy and that it is "necessary" to build up the "nuclear deterrent forces." The NATO defence ministers discussed aspects of the implementation of the program for a "defense initiative in the sphere of conventional arms," which provides for the production and purchase by 1992 of a new generation of nonnuclear weapons on a large scale -- weapons whose destructive properties approximate those of tactical nuclear weapons. The question of creating a European ABM system (the so-called Euro-SDI) to combat operational-tactical missiles and medium-range missiles was also discussed. Particular mention should be made of the approval, under Pentagon pressure, for plans for the large-scale production of a new generation of chemical weapons -- binary munitions.

Although major differences between Washington and its allies were revealed at the NATO session in connection with the White House refusal to continue to adhere to the provisions of the Soviet-American SALT II treaty, the participants in the NATO session, under U.S. pressure, reaffirmed their adherence to the course of confrontation with the socialist countries and to raising the level of military confrontation in Europe. Dangerous plans for the further buildup of NATO military arsenals were, as ever, concealed beneath unsubstantiated assertions about an "imbalance in conventional arms" and the supposedly continuing buildup of "Soviet military might."

Thus we are faced with two approaches to the resolution of very important problems for mankind. One -- that of the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact states -- is directed toward disarmament and the elimination of nuclear weapons, the lessening of military confrontation, especially in Europe, and broad international cooperation and security for the entire planet. The other approach is that of the United States and its supporting Western countries, which saw the Soviet initiatives as a mighty obstacle to the implementation of their own imperial designs. "Only a total failure to apprehend current realities can explain the U.S. leaders' gamble on brute force, on the nuclear fist, on terrorist piracy lavishly mixed with ideological intolerance

and hatred," M.S. Gorbachev noted in his report at the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum. "They continue to assess the present-day world situation in terms of 'star wars' and nuclear warheads, the arms race and militarist blackmail, thereby increasingly undermining security both for the entire world and for their own country."

The world is now at a crossroads, and where it goes depends largely on Europe's political position. By remaining what it is, Europe can and must make its contribution to molding a new way of political thinking in resolving problems of significance to all mankind and improving the general situation. The Soviet Union advocates a really constructive, fruitful dialogue between NATO and the Warsaw Pact, between West and East.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1483

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

BRIEFS

SOVIET OFFICIAL ON ARMS CONTROL--Rome, July 11 (KUNA)--A Soviet diplomat announced here Friday that there are positive signs that an agreement on arms control in Europe will be reached soon. The deputy director of the Political Planning Department at the Soviet Foreign Ministry said in a press conference here that there are positive indications showing that the East and West blocs will agree, in the Stockholm conference next September on arms control and limiting military activities, allowing observers from each side to attend military maneuvers and declaring commitment to non-use of force. The Stockholm conference will also prepare for the Vienna Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe next fall which aims at reaching an agreement on limiting traditional weapons in Europe, the Soviet official indicated. The Soviet diplomat left here today for Moscow after meeting with a number of Italian officials during his two-day stay here. [Text] [Kuwait KUNA in English 1720 GMT 11 Jul 86] /8309

CSO: 5200/2723

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS ON OPENING OF U.S.-SOVIET TEST BAN TALKS

Foreign Ministry Press Conference

LD211416 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1347 GMT 21 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow, 21 Jul (TASS) -- Soviet-U.S. negotiations on halting nuclear tests will open on 25 July, Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Information Department announced today at a press conference held here for Soviet and foreign journalists.

In order to solve the problem of nuclear weapons tests, he said, it is essential to draft an accord that would ban such tests under international law. On numerous occasions the USSR has proposed that work start without delay on drawing up such an accord. In March of this year it was proposed to the United States that bilateral negotiations be started on this issue. G. Gerasimov announced that A. Petrosyants, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Utilization of Atomic Energy, has been appointed to head the Soviet delegation at the negotiations.

As is known, the United States has until recently tried to reduce the issue of nuclear tests merely to monitoring nuclear explosions. During bilateral diplomatic contacts, agreement was reached whereby the two sides, starting 25 July, will conduct talks in Geneva between experts on a wide range of questions -- both verification and determining ways for a complete renunciation of nuclear tests.

This kind of formulation, the USSR Foreign Ministry representative noted, takes into account the positions of both sides and orients the talks toward achieving an effective accord on halting and banning all nuclear tests.

U.S. Attitude Questioned

LD240841 Moscow TASS in English 0836 GMT 24 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow July 24 TASS TASS news analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

Soviet and American experts on the problems of banning nuclear weapon tests are to meet in Geneva on Friday to discuss questions of controlling a nuclear test ban and find ways of bringing nuclear tests to an end.

This meeting is to be held at the initiative of the Soviet Union which has put forward an extensive programme for eliminating nuclear weapons on this planet by the beginning of the next century. Renunciation of nuclear explosions would considerably facilitate the process of eliminating nuclear weaponry, beginning with halting the development of new types of weapons.

What are the positions of the Soviet Union and the United States on this matter so important to all mankind?

It will be a year on August 6 since the Soviet Union has been refraining, voluntarily and unilaterally, from staging any nuclear explosions, including peaceful ones. One need not be a military expert to see the importance of this initiative of the Soviet Union which has decided to demonstrate, by the force of example, its invariable peaceable policy and to support it by practical actions. It must be noted, however, that while the Soviet moratorium has been in force the United States has already staged fourteen nuclear explosions in order to develop arms systems for so-called "star wars".

It goes without saying that the Soviet moratorium is not an end in itself but can and must be used as a basis from which it would be easier and simpler to begin the process of complete termination of nuclear explosions. The Soviet Union suggests that the U.S. Administration join in the moratorium to make it bilateral, that is Soviet-American.

But the ruling circles of the USA seem to be guided by different considerations. Everything in the American position has so far indicated a reluctance to end nuclear weapon tests. It is evidently hoped in Washington that the United States would be able to develop such new types of arms for the SDI system that would ensure for it superiority over the Soviet Union. But this will never happen because the Soviet Union is no less concerned about its security and the security of its allies. So the replacement of existing armaments by others, still more refined, is nothing else but a further intensification of the arms race and not trying to scale it down. Hence, if Washington talks of "arms control" it should mean a process of limitation and elimination, primarily, of nuclear weapons. In this connection the Geneva discussions on the problems of ending and banning nuclear explosions are to become an indicator of the real intentions of the two sides and show who is for and who is against the termination of nuclear explosions. The Soviet Union shows by all its actions that it wants nuclear weapons tests to be ended.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1484

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: INTERNATIONAL SCIENTISTS' FORUM TO END NUCLEAR TESTS

Meeting with Gorbachev

LD50200 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1823 GMT 14 Jul 86

["Mikhail Gorbachev's Meeting With Representatives of the International Scientist Forum for the Cessation of Nuclear Tests" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 14 Jul (TASS) -- Today, M.S. Gorbachev, at the request of the foreign participants, met with a group of scientists, the initiators of a forum.

Present were: G.B. Marini-Bettolo, professor of Rome University and member of the Papal Academy of Sciences; P. Starlinger, professor of Cologne University, FRG; K. (Fushimi), Japanese member of parliament; F. von Hippel, professor at Princeton University, USA; O. Nathan, rector of Copenhagen University, Denmark; J. Rotblatt, professor of the University of London, Great Britain; O.P. (Lenci), Union of Italian Scientists for Disarmament, Italy; P. (Derek), professor at Toronto University, Canada; T. (Atayev), professor at Ankara University, Turkey; A.T. Balevski, president of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences; S. Bergstroem, professor of the Karolinska Institute of Sweden; W. Kalweit, vice president of the GDR Academy of Sciences; T. Cochran, professor, chief geophysicist for seismography of the U.S. National Resources Defense Council; Soviet scientists A.P. Aleksandrov, president of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR; P.N. Pedoseyev and Ye.P. Velikov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; and Academicians Ye.I. Chazov, R.Z. Sagdeyev, A.M. Prokhorov, G.A. Arbatov, V.I. Godlanskiy, A.G. Aganbegyan, and Ye.M. Primakov.

Prof G.B. Marini-Bettolo handed M.S. Gorbachev a declaration that was unanimously adopted at the forum addressed to the leaders of all nuclear powers, first of all of the USSR and the United States.

When handing over the document, Marini-Bettolo said:

Esteemed Mr General Secretary! It is a great honor and a great satisfaction for me on behalf of all the participants of the international forum of scientists for the banning of nuclear tests, to hand you the text of the declaration on which we have worked for 3 days. This document is the result of open, constructive, mutually beneficial discussions. Our declaration was adopted unanimously.

This has become possible thanks to the atmosphere created both by the Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests, as well as by the cooperation of scientists in the sphere of setting up seismic monitoring to ensure that nuclear explosions are not carried out.

Allow me, Mr General Secretary, to express the wish and the hope that our actions and efforts will be understood and adopted by all leaders of states in the name of the good of all mankind.

M.S. Gorbachev: You are guests, I am here at your request, so if any of those who are present here wants to say something, please go ahead.

Prof F. von Hippel: I have been asked to say a few words in addition to those said by my colleague. The unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions, introduced by the Soviet Union, is of extraordinary significance and has had an enormous influence on world public opinion. It demonstrated the increased confidence of the Soviet Union in the new way of thinking. It proves once again your understanding of the fact that no new nuclear weapon can change the fact that the Soviet Union and the United States have the capacity to annihilate one another many times over.

A new way of thinking also is growing and gaining strength in the United States. The majority of physicists from leading U.S. universities have signed an open letter in which they declare their refusal to work for the SDI program because they consider it to be a dangerous business.

The Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions has also strengthened this new thinking in U.S. public opinion. Public opinion polls conducted at home show that presently a majority is in favor of the United States joining the Soviet moratorium. According to the latest data, this notion is supported by 56 percent of Americans.

Although the U.S. Congress does not usually intervene in issues of this kind -- it is a presidential prerogative -- nevertheless there is a significant minority in Congress that considers it necessary to reduce the appropriations assigned to conducting nuclear tests.

It is probable that the first proposal of that kind presented to the Congress will be defeated; but if it turns out that a sufficient number of congressmen favor that proposal and the difference in votes is insignificant, the positions of those against nuclear tests will become significantly stronger. Then, within a year, one could count on some positive changes. That, however, will only take place in the event the Soviet Union continues its unilateral moratorium.

The forces of peace in the United States have grown significantly strong thanks to cooperation between the USSR Academy of Sciences and the U.S. Natural Resources Defense Council. The U.S. public is afraid that the Soviet Union is hiding its secrets and this fear is being exploited by the advocates of creating new nuclear weapons.

Your assent to the installation of U.S. seismic equipment in the region of Semipalatinsk, that is, in the region where Soviet nuclear tests are conducted, shows that new thinking exists in practice in the Soviet Union and is manifest in the desire to provide others with the opportunity of seeing what you are doing.

Judging from an article in THE NEW YORK TIMES, the U.S. public shows interest in our joint undertaking, and, evidently, this interest will grow as our joint activity expands. Apart from the fact that seismologists long to allay fears regarding the secrecy of the Soviet Union, they are also in fact reaffirming that it is possible, with the aid of instruments, to avoid any possibility of concealing the slightest nuclear explosion.

I have a seismograph printout that clearly shows how a few years ago an earthquake in Kamchatka was pinpointed in Norway. It also pinpoints a small nuclear explosion (500 tons) which was carried out at the same time at a distance of approximately 2,000 km from the apparatus. It illustrates that with the aid of such equipment it is possible to pinpoint even the most insignificant nuclear explosions.

Ye. P. Velikhov: I would like to say very briefly that scientists from 32 countries have attended our forum, and over 70 people have spoken. Among these are seismologists and physicists who have been involved in the development of nuclear weapons. Questions of the consequences of the use of nuclear weapons have also been discussed.

It has been a broad forum and its main conclusions are as follows: It has been shown in a very representative manner that a problem such as monitoring practically does not exist as a technical problem, and that monitoring by methods developed by geophysicists is entirely reliable. Of course, there are various possibilities to conceal nuclear blasts. But, we see that the improvement of seismic technology makes it possible practically to beat those possibilities.

The work now being conducted jointly by the USSR Academy of Sciences and the U.S. Natural Resources Defense Council is directed at this point. The question of what importance a complete ban on all nuclear tests would have was also discussed at the forum. Speakers paid particular attention to the fact that both in the past and in the future the result of conducting underground nuclear tests was and will be the creation of new kinds of nuclear weapons that destabilize the world situation. Therefore, the complete ban on tests is required, as well as the blocking of all channels for the qualitative development [razvitiye] of nuclear weapons.

Professor Cochran also spoke at the forum. Together with Soviet scientists, he has already had time to install seismic equipment near Semipalatinsk and to obtain the first oscillogram.

O. Nathan: We all have been very much impressed by the speech of Dr T. Taylor, who was one of the creators of atomic weapons in the United States. He explained that it takes a lot of time to develop [razvitiye] new nuclear weapons through tests; therefore the Soviet Union need not worry about the fact that the United States has not yet taken a sensible decision regarding nuclear tests. He also said that the USSR should continue its moratorium without fear that the United States may create new weapons in a short time.

M.S. Gorbachev: It is not Teller who is for intensifying the arms race?

Voices: No, they have similar names.

M.S. Gorbachev: Because I was about to express doubt as to the necessity of listening to your view, as we know Teller's point of view very well.

J. Rotblatt: I would like to add something regarding public opinion polls about the Soviet initiative in Great Britain. The following question was asked: "Should Great Britain reciprocate the Soviet Union's unilateral nuclear moratorium?" Eighty-four percent replied "yes." The most interesting thing is that 60 percent of conservatives, that is, Margaret Thatcher's supporters, replied to the question in the affirmative.

M.S. Gorbachev: That is interesting, interesting also from the political point of view. After all, presidents and prime ministers get to their office as the result of a majority of votes at elections...

J. Rotblatt: ...A few observations on the role of scientists taking part in the forum.

We are discussing a question that above all is political, while we are scientists. But, scientists have played a great and at times negative role in this question. Anyway, sometimes we were forced to act that way. I am saying this as one of those who began the work on developing an atom bomb in Great Britain at the beginning of World War II. Even later, many scientists voluntarily and even enthusiastically participated in the nuclear arms race. This race continuously feeds on the constant making of new scientific discoveries. This not only provides an impulse, but at times also affects the rate of the nuclear race.

Almost any scientific achievement is very rapidly adapted to the purposes of destruction, and this is absolutely wrong; it should be the reverse: science is called upon to serve mankind's prosperity.

There exist enormous possibilities for the international cooperation of scientists.

Let us take, for example, the catastrophe at Chernobyl. It may have been possible in connection with this to develop such a program, that would have brought great benefit to generations of people.

During the discussion of the problem of banning nuclear tests, we as scientists gave you, a political figure, our recommendation, which will help you in your further steps that aim to halt the nuclear arms race.

We hope that the efforts we have undertaken will help to revive the tarnished image of science as a creative force that will bring benefit and prosperity to mankind.

T. Cochran: I am proud to have had the honor of seeing you. As you know, our U.S. Natural Resources Defense Council signed an agreement with the USSR Academy of Science only 1 month ago. As those who have spoken before me have already said, the chief aim of our cooperation consists of disproving the view, which is current among U.S. political figures and the U.S. people, that it is allegedly impossible to infallibly discover all nuclear explosions in the Soviet Union. We thereby are striving to show that the United States should also halt testing without delay and act in the direction of concluding an agreement on a total ban of nuclear tests.

Our best seismologists from two universities, California and Colorado, have been chosen for cooperation. We arrived in your country only 6 days ago.

Thanks to the assistance of Soviet scientists at the Institute of Terrestrial Physics, we have set up equipment at one of the three sites selected for this purpose. We have already received the first seismographs from Karkalinsk, which is situated approximately 200 kilometers west of the test site.

M.S. Gorbachev: In the White House, they do not believe that the Soviet Union will agree to the most-ranging, to any form of monitoring -- both national and international -- including even on-site inspection and the setting up of apparatus.

It appears that political leadership aside -- well, truthfully, aside does not come into it -- this work has already been done, and without any red tape. The principal question from your side is this: monitoring the end of tests and the nonconducting of tests, and not monitoring their continuation and the perfection of nuclear weapons.

T. Cochran: I believe that we have utterly destroyed the arguments put forward by the White House that an all-embracing treaty on banning the nuclear tests is impossible and does not stand up to full monitoring.

M.S. Gorbachev: We are of the same opinion. I think that no one, neither the Soviet Union nor the United States, can count on outwitting the other; nor should they proceed from the point of somehow causing damage to the other side's security. Such an approach is impermissible. I think that in our time this is also a sign of the new thinking. Security must be equal, otherwise it gives rise to suspicion and a lack of confidence. There is no stability; it is violated as a result of suspicion and mistrust. Then you have a build-up of the arms race in the quest for security for oneself just as insurance.

This is the kind of situation that is created psychologically. That is why a new thinking is necessary.

T. Cochran: Cooperation between Soviet and U.S. scientists may be termed perfectly exceptional.

The assistance given by Academician Velikhov and all the other participants in our joint experiments is beyond all praise. It will be very difficult for us to respond completely in the same way when the Soviet scientists come to the United States.

The joint Soviet-U.S. research program about which we are speaking has already met with the most favorable response in the United States. In order to consolidate this new method, this new approach, it is very important to extend our research program. It shows that scientists can not only make good political statements but also carry out very valuable joint scientific tests.

A.T. Balevski: I would like to say a few words in connection with the speech by the colleague from Denmark. I do not know who is in front, that is unknown. But I do know that the continuation of U.S. nuclear experiments creates a constant dread for mankind. This psychological moment is very important, and this is what I spoke about at the forum. This is terrible, and even more so, when they do not notice how human spirits are decaying. It is a terrible thing to live in constant dread, and I think that we must give people the chance to relax and live like human beings. No one has the right to keep mankind in a constant state of tension. This is a crime, whatever the intentions.

S. Bergstroem: I was chairman of the Committee on the Medical Consequences of a Nuclear War, which was set up by the WHO. Two years ago we presented a paper on the results of our work. The unique cooperation between Soviet and U.S. scientists had an immense positive influence on world public opinion.

M.S. Gorbachev: I welcome the great contribution medical scientists have made: I have in mind, above all, Academician Chazov and Professor Iovane. It was very important that a competent declaration by outstanding representatives of world medicine on the possible consequences of a nuclear conflict, as well as on the ability of medicine to carry out its role in case some madman unleashes such a conflict, ring out to the world.

S. Bergstroem: Cooperation in the matter of monitoring nuclear explosions, as many stressed at the forum, has already improved the international climate. We think that now it would be important to extend activity beyond the limits of this sphere to include participation in solving other major problems, especially in developing countries.

If your scientists, your academicians, came forward with an initiative of this type, it would play an enormous role and would make it possible to draw up a long-term program for the improvement of international relations as a whole.

G.F. (Lenci): I would like to say -- and this was noted in the declaration adopted by our forum -- that the Soviet unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions largely assisted the creation of the new atmosphere. It is, in fact, the first real step in the direction of a comprehensive treaty on the banning of nuclear tests, which in its turn sometime may lead to a complete liquidation of nuclear weapons.

I also think that the preservation and extension of the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions will have an influence on other countries, in particular on mine, Italy, which does not have nuclear weapons but is a member of certain organizations. It seems to me that countries like Italy can play a different role from the one they are now playing in solving this problem, they could, in particular, be roused to undertake more energetic actions in support of concluding an agreement on a total nuclear weapons ban.

P.N. Fedoseyev: One of the characteristic features of the forum has been that not only concern in connection with the present international situation was felt, but also the desire to act incessantly, to display initiative in the direction of a ban on tests and against nuclear weapons in general.

The concluding round table included a program of further actions as one of its points.

In both the forum and the lobbies, the suggestion was made that the initiative group not discontinue its activity, but continue not only to spread the documents adopted and the results of the forum throughout the world, but also to act as a liaison and information group of the scientific public. This group undertook to continue its work.

A.P. Aleksandrov: I have been to many international forums, but I must note that this is the first time I have witnessed such unity of views as has been the case here.

All of us, representatives of various countries, could have different points of view on individual issues, but all were united as to the fact that one must not allow a nuclear war to arise, that this will be the destruction and degradation of mankind.

M.S. Gorbachev: As a minimum, degradation; but, as the most realistic alternative -- death.

A.P. Aleksandrov: All involved considered this to be very important, it has been called different things: The first step, a most important step, but, in general these have been various nuances of one and the same opinion -- that unilateral cessation of tests by the Soviet Union has been an extremely important circumstance that has had worldwide impact.

Everyone was also of the opinion that, beginning with the United States, other countries too, both those possessing nuclear weapons as well as those not possessing them, should

align themselves with the Soviet Union's position. This will be of extraordinary importance and will lead to an easing of the colossal tension in international relations that now exists.

K. (Fushimi): I highly appraise the Soviet leader's brave decision to stop underground nuclear testing. This is not just my opinion, but, I would say, the opinion of a large number of Japanese citizens. I have with me several pieces of evidence of the Japanese people's feelings. One such document I brought with me is a message from religious leaders in Hiroshima. (He hands M.S. Gorbachev the message)

P. Derek: Five years ago I, along with some colleagues, founded the organization "Science for Peace." Since that time I have attended a great variety of conferences on the subject of disarmament, the struggle for peace, and so on, in the Soviet Union, and I would like to say that our forum, in which I have just been taking part, has, for reasons that have already been set out here, made the deepest impression on me. All of us, at least the Western participants in the forum, will return home in a more optimistic frame of mind and more resolute in our hope to achieve something, however small, for the sake of peace.

M.S. Gorbachev: First of all, I would like, through you, to greet all participants in the Moscow forum of scientists. It is dedicated to the most burning problem of the present, linked with the preservation of human civilization.

The initiative put into effect at this forum of scientists from over 30 countries is exceptionally important, just as is all that is being done at present to halt the arms race and to start a realistic disarmament process.

I have already had the opportunity to say, but taking the opportunity of this meeting I would like to say it once more: We can still hear voices: Why such haste? Why such hurry? Maybe it would be better to spread all this struggle against the arms race over the years or even decades? Such opinions are mistaken. We have come to such a stage in the scientific-technical revolution when new discoveries can whip up the arms race even more and create a situation in which it would be much more difficult even to start talks.

Let us imagine that the arms race spreads to space. Who can vouch for what can happen then? Presently, there are a few scores of satellites and spaceships flying around and even so, all kind of extraordinary things happen to them. And if there are echelons of military systems? Computer technology controls them and gives information, but it is not interested why something happens. As a result, "decisions" on which the fate and life of millions depend, will be taken not on a political, but on a technological level. All of civilization will be the hostage of technology.

Or, let us take the conventional arms sphere. The achievements of science here, too, create base for the emergence of weapons that by their strike properties are not inferior to nuclear ones. Besides this, there are chemical and biological weapons. The consequences of their use are not any less lethal.

This is why we all are at a point beyond which unpredictable processes may start, and all have to act -- politicians, scientists, and people.

This morning I received the Russian text of the declaration by participants in your forum. I would like to express my attitude to this document right away: It is a crucial document that meets the interests of all countries regardless of what political

organizations they belong to. The document is of particular significance in connection with the fact that it was put together and adopted by competent people and was adopted unanimously, which gives it even greater weight.

The results of your forum testify to the fact that the preconditions for the formation of new approaches, of a new thinking in order to solve the chief issues -- stopping the nuclear arms race and engaging in disarmament -- have matured in the world. This must begin, as you correctly say, with ending nuclear tests.

In the declaration you bring to the attention of all the world public that we are facing a simple, pitiless fact: Human civilization will not survive a nuclear war. This warning is both timely and convincing and demands a high degree of responsibility.

You asked a question on reducing the risk of nuclear war, of the need for active measures. The Soviet leadership will support this appeal, in accordance with your view that the halting of nuclear tests should be the first step in this direction.

Convincing arguments saying that the monitoring of halting nuclear tests is possible rang out both in the declaration and here at our meeting. This is of enormous significance as it reflects the view of people who know what they are talking about.

We are assisting and will continue to assist Soviet and U.S. scientists in order for them to realize their initiative in using special apparatus to ensure [kontrol] that nuclear explosions are not being carried out.

I have no objections against a single line of your document.

You appeal to the Soviet Government to review yet again the issue of prolonging the moratorium. Well, in the first place, it is in force at the moment, and this is the main thing. So, there is still time, and it should not be lost. Your appeal will naturally receive very careful attention. The Soviet Government will make a decision and you will be informed of it. But frankly, what it will be significantly depends on whether or not the United States intends to engage in disarmament.

After my meeting with the U.S. President in Geneva, where we agreed to move toward giving their accord real, specific content, we took such action. We extended the moratorium; we extended it twice. We adopted a 15-year program for eliminating nuclear weapons. We proposed new, far-reaching measures for monitoring the destruction of enterprises producing these weapons. We proposed a huge program for conventional weapons reductions in order to remove the anxiety of the people of Western countries. Finally, we recently introduced compromise proposals at the Geneva talks. I explained them in a letter to President Reagan. They refer to both medium-range missiles and strategic nuclear weapons reductions.

We naturally counted on an equivalent response from the U.S. side, and from the West in general. So far, we are not satisfied with the position of either the U.S. Administration or the other Western governments. The administration's position is negative on halting nuclear tests. In its time, the problem of monitoring was put forward as an argument against this.

Now, at a time when, as we can see, it finds a convincing solution in the shape of the Soviet Union's well-known position, and in the shape of your own arguments -- that is, the arguments of scientists -- we await what new grounds for continuing tests will be dragged out into the light. We are already getting wind of arguments that apparently

the Soviet leadership's whole idea about liquidating nuclear weapons is a utopia, because in such a world, it seems it is impossible to get by without these weapons.

We still have not received any satisfactory answers to our proposals on medium-range missiles and on strategic weapons. The only thing we have had is an announcement that SALT II is dead. Thus, not only are no efforts being made to find and develop new international mechanisms that would erect a barrier to the arms race, and then deal with disarmament, but the final brakes to this race are being removed. It seems that another reason why SDI is necessary is because nowadays many countries are capable of creating their own nuclear bomb and therefore, so they say, it is necessary to have the means to counteract in case some madman launches a nuclear attack or starts to employ nuclear blackmail.

In order to defend SDI, quite paradoxical arguments are being produced. Alas, they are finding a certain response in the circles of scientists and politicians. They are saying that SDI is the road to the development of science and to new heights of scientific-technical progress. But I say to you that this is reason turned inside out, everything turned upside down. Surely we can progress in science, technology, and all components of scientific knowledge, including the creation of new materials, radio electronics, computer technology, mathematics, and so on, in implementing peaceful projects. The "Vega" program is a vivid and convincing example of this. That is a very interesting project. I listened to Academician Sagdeyev and other scientists of ours who implemented it with the participation of foreign scientists. New solutions were needed in order to guarantee control over the guidance of a complex piece of equipment at vast distances. This was resolved. Stable radio and television communication was required; that was achieved. New mathematical discoveries and calculations for dealing with that very complex task were required. They were made.

Accurate information about Venus and Halley's comet had to be provided. That was done.

Many countries took part in the project, including Western countries. There is particularly fruitful cooperation between Soviet and French scientists in this area.

Now we have undertaken to solve the problem of obtaining a reliable energy source. Energy issues, like issues concerning food and ecology are the central global issues for the future. If there were no plans connected with military matters this peaceful project would advance all the more quickly. Recently N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, presented to the United Nations on behalf of the Soviet Government our proposals on the development of international scientific cooperation with the aim of the peaceful use of space.

Thus, science can be advanced in a peaceful field. The argument alleging that science and technology can be advanced only with the aid of the arms race is absurd.

The question arises, well what is going on? Who has taken away -- God? -- the capacity to understand the realities of the present-day world, of the nuclear missile and space age?

These two people here (points to portraits of K. Marx and V.I. Lenin) taught us to figure things out thoroughly. You have to clear all the garbage from the surface and bring out the motives, the interests lying at the basis of this or that position.

Whose interests are served by the proposals of political forces, scientists and the public insisting on a reduction in the arms race, on embarking upon disarmament, and

finally destroying nuclear weapons? I think it serves the interests of all people. And there are no higher interests than that.

We understand that there may be interests of a group of countries that want to use their over abundance of weapons for political pressure. There are other interests, I would say, of a lower order. There exist the interests of the military-industrial complex. This is also real. But, in the first place, these are not the interests of one nation or another, far less of human civilization; and in the second place, neither peaceful research nor energy research, and so on, would suffer from a halt in military research and production. Those forces that today are engaged in the creation of weapons could work fruitfully in peaceful areas. Neither science, nor enterprises connected now with military matters would remain unoccupied. On the contrary, everyone would win.

Thus, a new way of thinking is needed. The pressing questions of the present times, let alone those of the next century, cannot be answered using the ideas typical of the past centuries, even decades, and in any case of the time before the emergence of nuclear weapons and the expansion of the scientific and technical revolution that has been observed only recently.

I do not want to impose my judgment and do not expect you to adopt it without thinking. We gave a rendering of our views at the congress. Their gist can be summed up by saying that we are all living in a nuclear and space age, living in a complex, interrelated world full of contradictions. We have to learn how to live together, no matter how different we might be. Other countries have their own kind of democracy, and let them use it as much as they want. They should not infringe, however, on our right to use our own democratic values. But these are all secondary questions anyway.

The principal issue is that we will either survive, cooperating and preserving earth, ocean, sky, the entire environment, or we will bring civilization to a fatal end. We must rid ourselves of ideas whose time has passed, particularly that of seeing the world as one's domain. The present-day world is one of cohabitation of peoples and states, it is a multitude of countries, each with a history of its own and existing at a certain stage in its development. Everyone, however, should admit that every country has a right to choose its own state structure, to conduct matters independently. We recognize that and will act accordingly. But we demand that this rule also be respected by others. If this sovereign right is not recognized for each country, each people, chaos will come to international relations.

It is not enough, however, to recognize this philosophically, one must also behave in conformity with this and act accordingly. You can be certain that we will firmly adhere to this conviction. At the same time, we do not at all wish to consign the fate of the world and our own country, and that of other peoples, to the mercy of those who intend to dictate their will to the entire world.

When we speak of the United States, with which we are constantly conducting discussions, at time sharp ones, we do not at all depict it in an unrelievedly black light, or even in two colors: black and white. We see the real America, America as it is. We know that there are also many people in U.S. society who share a realistic approach to contemporary problems.

We must work and create a new type of relations in international and inter-state affairs. Neither the Soviet Union nor the United States will succeed in commanding the world. The world has changed. If this is not acknowledged, great mistakes may be made in policies. We proceed from precisely this premise, and you will become convinced of

it. I think that the Soviet Union has already provided serious arguments confirming this point of view.

Returning to the forum's theme, I wish to say in conclusion that I am in total agreement with your view that an end to nuclear tests would be a major step in the right direction: toward stopping the arms race and the perfection of nuclear weapons, and ultimately, toward their elimination.

The thought was expressed here that this forum of yours should not be the only act, and that the initiating group should continue its work.

A useful example of this is the initiative of Soviet and U.S. doctors. After all, it started with what appeared to be a one-time-only meeting for them, but it developed into a movement, a very influential movement of authoritative people. And I think that if scientists connected with another field, with technology, continue the efforts begun in Moscow, we will only welcome it. But this, of course, is your affair.

I am very satisfied at this meeting and, what is the main thing, with its spirit and content. It is necessary for politics, and science to cooperate now as never before. There should be no science in our time that does not consider the political consequences that some or other discovery or achievement may have. And there should be no politics that are not guided by the achievements of science, its strict analysis, objective assessments and forecasts.

I am in favor of a union of politics and science. This will lead to a gain for every state both in internal affairs and in solving such problems as the ones we have been talking about together today.

I thank you. I hope that the affair, which you have begun, will develop and receive the support of all those who are concerned about the present situation in the world.

Scientists Hold Press Conference

LD142128 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1845 GMT 14 Jul 86

[Press conference at USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 14 July chaired by Gerasimov, chief of the Information Department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, with Academician Yevgeniy Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; U.S. scientist Professor (Devint) -- not further identified; Academician Fedoseyev, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Professor Nathan -- not further identified; U.S. Professor Theodore Taylor; Professor Joseph Rotblatt of London University; Professor Frank von Hippel of Princeton University; Professor Thomas Cochran, chief geologist of the U.S. National Resources Defense Council; and Professor Giovanni Marini-Bettoli of Rome University -- recorded; individual speakers introduced by announcer's voice-over; video shows participants seated on platform]

[Text] [Velikhov] The idea of holding the forum was first expressed during the conference of scientists which discussed questions of the struggle against the nuclear threat and stopping the arms race. During that conference some of our guests from various countries met and we discussed a wide range of technical problems connected with this. The idea was put forward -- an idea was born during a discussion of these matters with Professor Von Hippel, who represented the Federation of American scientists -- of jointly conducting scientific research, using the very latest potential of seismology and seismography, up-to-date technology, in order to prove how reliably we are able

to verify the halting of all nuclear tests. Naturally, it was suggested that it was one thing to discuss and talk, but another thing to work jointly on it. And so the Soviet scientists supported the idea of the American scientists that a joint Soviet-U.S. group should be set up that would conduct such experiments near the Soviet test base in the area of Semipalatinsk, and the American test base in Nevada.

We started preparing for these experiments -- and we agreed that we would do it very quickly -- in a period of about 1 month. The Soviet scientists appealed to the Soviet Government and the American scientists to the U.S. Government, and to a number of organizations for help in this work. The Soviet Government examined this question very carefully and gave permission for the Soviet scientists to carry out such joint work with the American scientists. It must be stated that the work went fairly quickly. We agreed that it was advisable to hold a forum at the beginning of July, and simultaneously that by that time we would try to install seismic equipment in the place we had agreed on for further research. On Sunday, the second day of the forum, Professor Cochrane, a geophysicist in charge of the Council for Environmental Protection in the United States, reported to the forum that the equipment was installed, that joint work had begun and that the first oscillograms had been plotted.

I shall try to give a brief summing-up of the importance of the forum. The forum discussed the question of the technical means of monitoring compliance with a moratorium and subsequently a total ban on nuclear weapons testing. And so, technically speaking, the road to concluding a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty is open.

Today, after the forum had concluded, we presented Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev with the forum's declaration, which was adopted virtually unanimously. Having read the document, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said he considered this a responsible document composed by a competent forum and deserving the most serious attention. The Soviet Government will examine and reply to the questions posed in the declaration.

[(Devint)] in English with superimposed Russian translation] The installation at Semipalatinsk last week of monitoring apparatus is evidence of the Soviet Union's serious interest in ensuring mutual trust between our countries. And it is very good that we were allowed to install such equipment just before installing analogous equipment in the United States. I think this shows that the Soviet Union is prepared to prove through its actions its interest in this issue.

[Fedoseyev] Academician Velikhov has reported here on the chief provisions of the declaration, and the results of the forum. It is perhaps only worth emphasizing again that the declaration speaks very strongly and vividly of the danger that threatens humanity when nuclear weapons are put into action. We, the declaration says, are faced with a simple and relentless reality: Human civilization will not survive a nuclear war. And the fact that this is stated by authoritative scientists from over 30 countries gives great weight to such a declaration. The view was general, and it is reflected in the concluding section of the document that states that in the future a total monitored nuclear test ban could lead to the total elimination of nuclear weapons and other means of mass destruction.

[Nathan in English with superimposed Russian translation] I would like very briefly to draw your attention to two very important clauses in our declaration. These lines are at the bottom of the first page. It is stated here: We hope that on its side, the United States will adopt a decision on a moratorium identical to the decision made by the Soviet Government. And we hope that the Soviet Government will be able to maintain the moratorium. The Soviet Government's present moratorium expires on 6 August, and we decisively call on both governments -- on the Soviet Government to continue the moratorium, and on the U.S. Government to join the moratorium.

[Taylor] For me, this forum has been an important step in my consciousness of the perniciousness of nuclear weapons. Shortly after the end of World War II, I was in Los Alamos where the first atomic bomb was built. I was one of those who supported the creation of nuclear weapons. We saw in what we were doing the possibility of putting an end to war, by making weapons so numerous and so large that war would become impossible. However, the wars in Korea and Vietnam showed that we had adopted an incorrect position. I have totally changed my views about nuclear weapons. I stopped seeing them as weapons of universal power, and now feel a total aversion to them. I could not in any way support any policies that advocate the use of nuclear weapons, whatever the conditions.

I think that this forum has brought the 150 delegates who participated in it to the same conviction. With the help of the American public, we would like to call on the U.S. Government to follow the courageous example of the Soviet Union. The other nuclear countries -- the United Kingdom, France, and China -- should also join this all-embracing process for a nuclear test ban. And this must happen soon.

[Rotblatt in English with superimposed Russian translation] We have been talking about the new thinking, which amounts to the fact that possession of a large number of weapons, and carrying out a greater number of tests, in no way increases one's security.

I think that only measures for halting the arms race will lead us to greater security. I would like to stress that opinion in other countries is gradually changing as a result of the moratorium declared by the Soviet Union. Opinion polls in the United States demonstrate that during the 3 months following the second extension of the moratorium, the number of people in favor of a similar step by the United States increased from 40 to 56 percent. This is a considerable increase. In the United Kingdom a public opinion poll in which people were asked whether, following the Soviet moratorium, similar measures by the British Government should follow, 84 percent answered in the affirmative.

[Question by SANA correspondent in Russian] The forum representatives had a meeting today with Mr. Gorbachev. Will there be a meeting with Mr Reagan, and to what extent are you sure that Mr Reagan will pay attention to your appeal?

[Von Hippel in English with superimposed Russian translation] We will ask for a meeting with Reagan but I do not know whether he will receive us. And as to the second part of the question on how our declaration will be reflected in U.S. policies, I would think rather that it will have an impact on public opinion, which in its turn should influence policies. But this has been a very important exchange of opinions among scientists from all over the world.

[Question by unidentified journalist] Will the Semiplatinsk station be permanent, and will there be American scientists there all the time, either on a temporary or on a permanent basis? And further, has there been a reaction from the U.S. Administration to the suggestion of installing a similar station in Nevada?

[Cochran in English with superimposed Russian translation] We plan to use such stations in the Soviet Union and in the United States for 1 year. Shortly before that time is up we will get together and decide whether such stations are to continue operating further. If we decide that it is in our interests to continue operating such stations, we will do so.

As to the question about Nevada, I have made inquiries with the U.S. Government. There are no provisions in the agreement that would prevent Soviet scientists from going

to Nevada and installing similar equipment. What we are talking about is similar equipment that will be installed at three stations in the area of Nevada around the test-site. I think that in the near future, sometime toward November, we will see Soviet scientists in the Nevada area.

[Marini-Bettolo in English with superimposed Russian translation] I found it most interesting to be able to have a meeting freely with General Secretary Gorbachev and to discuss with him the questions we had been dealing with. I believe our group was meeting here a man who understands our feelings well. I hope that this meeting will lead to certain definite results on the international scene.

Forum Issues Declaration

PM171009 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jul 86 First Edition p 5

["Declaration of the Participants in the International Forum of Scientists for a Nuclear Test Ban" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Gathered in Moscow at the International Forum of Scientists for a Nuclear Test Ban, we had the opportunity informally to discuss the key problems of our time -- the nuclear arms race and the improvement of new types of nuclear weapons that lead to a decrease in nuclear stability.

In the course of an open discussion, scientists from various fields of study were able to air their views about the serious problems engendered by nuclear weapons and about practical steps to improve the situation.

We have to face a simple, inexorable fact: Human civilization will not survive a nuclear war. The most sophisticated technological systems can fail unexpectedly with catastrophic consequences. The recent tragic events with the Challenger and at Chernobyl have emphatically pointed this out.

In order to reduce the risk of nuclear war, active steps are necessary. We are convinced that the first step along this path could be a verifiable comprehensive ban on nuclear tests. Since the aim of the tests is the development [razrabotka] of new weapon systems this ban would curb the nuclear arms race. In the longer term, a verifiable [poddayushcheyesya proverke] comprehensive test ban would mean a step toward the destruction of all nuclear arsenals. This would mark a resolute breakthrough toward confidence building, the triumph of common sense, and open international intercourse.

To achieve this aim a new way of thinking is needed. The Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests is the most important manifestation of this new way of thinking that has opened up unique opportunities for achieving a comprehensive nuclear test ban. We hope that the United States will, in turn, adopt the same decision on a moratorium. We hope that the Soviet Government will deem it possible to extend the moratorium. We also hope that the moratorium as well as other initiatives aimed at lowering the risk of nuclear war will be joined by all nuclear powers in all parts of the world.

As for the problem of verifying a comprehensive nuclear test ban, we are convinced that the latest achievements in the sphere of seismology together with jointly observed international procedures, including on-site inspection [inspektsiya], will ensure a high

level of confidence that tests are not being carried out any longer. This confidence will be further strengthened if international scientific cooperation is further developed.

Our forum welcomes the agreement concluded between the USSR Academy of Sciences and the U.S. Natural Resources Defense Council in accordance with which U.S. and Soviet scientists have installed seismic equipment on Soviet territory near Semipalatinsk. This initiative provides clear evidence of the feasibility of the joint verification of compliance with a comprehensive nuclear test ban. We call for further joint initiatives and the involvement of other participants.

We appeal to the leaders of all nuclear powers and in particular the Soviet Union and the United States to strive for an agreement on banning all nuclear tests.

We also ask the UN Secretary General Mr Perez de Cuellar to use his great authority to promote the solution of this task which, in the forum's view, is of exceptional importance for all the world's countries.

We are convinced that the security of all mankind, just like the immediate security of the Soviet Union and the United States would be substantially consolidated if a comprehensive nuclear test ban were achieved. We also hope that in the longer term a verifiable comprehensive nuclear test ban could lead to the complete destruction of nuclear arms and other means of mass destruction.

'New Thinking' Gaining Ground

LD151700 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 15 Jul 86

[Aleksandr Zholkver commentary]

[Text] The very first reactions to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's meeting with the representatives of the international scientists forum, which was held in Moscow, point to the great interest in the issues raised here; what is at issue is the most important problem of the present day linked with the preservation of human civilization.

Top scientists from over 300 countries are giving a clear warning about the menacing danger of a devastating nuclear war. At the same time, with the same sense of authority and unanimity, they reaffirm that this threat can be reduced and eliminated. A complete ban on nuclear tests could be a first step along this road.

A principally new situation has recently emerged in this regard. The Soviet Union unilaterally introduced a moratorium on all nuclear explosions and has already extended it twice. This specific evidence of a new way of thinking, scientists are noting, is having an immense bearing on public opinion, including the United States, where the call to join in the Soviet Union's initiative is gaining scope.

One should add to this that lately the thesis that an end to nuclear tests would be difficult or even totally impossible to monitor, has proven that the technical problems of monitoring even the most insignificant nuclear explosions virtually do not exist. The joint actions of Soviet and U.S. scientists in setting up monitoring equipment on USSR territory reaffirm that, given goodwill, the military-political aspects of this problem are perfectly soluble.

I would, however, like to make the point that it is a question of monitoring an end to not a continuation of nuclear tests. Meanwhile, calls are still being heard from Washington for continued nuclear weapons tests, including for their use in outer space. This is really thinking turned inside out.

To the credit of the majority of U.S. scientists, and, in general, the majority of U.S. people -- as a public opinion poll in the United States shows -- one must say that they reject this line of thought. Of course, the interests of the extremely influential military-industrial complex in the United States exist. But the international forum of scientists in Moscow clearly showed that the new thinking, which recognizes the vital need to halt the arms race, is carving out a still broader path. The Soviet Union, for its part, will do all it can to promote this.

'Important Landmark'

LD162114 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 16 Jul 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast; commentary by Tomas Kolesnichenko, PRAVDA international information editor]

[Text] Hello, comrades! It is said that big things can best be seen at a distance, but it can already be said with certainty that the International Forum of Scientists for a Nuclear Test Ban which has been held in Moscow has become an important landmark in the general antiwar movement of our times. I will point out first of all that the participants of the Moscow forum may be said to represent the cream of world science, therefore their voice in defense of peace and a realistic process of disarmament and against the arms race has a particularly authoritative ring to it. Now politicians have got a first hand -- as the saying goes -- objective, profoundly scientific and competent conclusion on the impermissibility of outbreak of nuclear war, for it would destroy human civilization. It is also a fundamentally important fact that the scientists who gathered together from 32 countries unanimously stressed that the first step, or it could also be called the major step, in the struggle against the threat of nuclear catastrophe is cessation of nuclear tests. To speak specifically, they gave a high evaluation of the unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests, and called upon the United States and other nuclear powers to join in it.

There is another remarkable fact, one that emerged very clearly during the meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and representatives of the Moscow forum. The scientists cited convincing figures from various countries that testify to the wide support for a moratorium on nuclear explosions.

Finally, perhaps the most important thing that was demonstrated by the Moscow forum of scientists is that the new way of thinking appropriate to our nuclear-space epoch is increasingly taking hold of people's minds. Doctors, architects, people of diverse professions and political views, and now scientists are uniting their efforts. They understand that in our times one cannot think in the categories of the past, that is, rely on the force of arms and use them to solve world problems.

Now it is up to politicians in the West, and first and foremost the United States. But for the time being we are hearing only their echoes of explosions. It has become known, for instance that the next explosion at the Nevada testing ground has been set for tomorrow, 17 July. Is this not an example of sluggish thinking, falling back on the old doctrine rejected by life itself? The scientists, who set up the seismic equipment in the testing area have once again proved that there are simply no technical grounds for banning nuclear tests. But there is something else, namely the unwillingness of the U.S. leaders to heed the voice of the world public, which is more and more decisively demanding that nuclear tests be halted and that a beginning be made on real disarmament. The Moscow forum of scientists for halting nuclear tests demonstrated this yet again.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1484

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

SOVIET REPORTS ON U.S. SCIENTISTS IN USSR TO MONITOR TESTS

Press Briefing

LD151327 Moscow TASS in English 1255 GMT 15 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow July 15 TASS -- The project of Soviet and American scientists to install seismographic equipment on Soviet and U.S. territories respectively to monitor nuclear explosions is of paramount significance, said Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief of the Information Department of the USSR Foreign Ministry.

Addressing a briefing here today, he stressed that the creation of such a station on the Soviet Union's territory completely refutes the opinion widespread in the West that the Russians cannot be trusted and therefore, as they claim, testing cannot be stopped. Now that there are monitoring stations near the Soviet nuclear proving grounds, this argument is falling to pieces. We have once again proved that we are for control and are ready for large-scale measures of control, including on-site inspection, the spokesman for the USSR Foreign Ministry pointed out.

Now not a single test will escape the stringent control of high frequency seismographers. Gennadiy Gerasimov drew the attention of the journalists to the statement by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at a meeting with scientists yesterday that the fight against the arms race cannot be protracted for years and even less for decades. It is necessary to speed up the whole thing, failing which military technology, which is developing at a very fast rate, will leave us behind. A time may come when the main decisions, for example, on button pushing will be taken not by presidents but by technology. Imperfect people cannot create perfect technology, but technology, as the latest accidents have shown, errs in both cases. The request of scientists, in particular of U.S. scientists, that the Soviet leadership extend the moratorium even after August 6 will be examined, the spokesman for the USSR Foreign Ministry said. The decision of the Soviet side will depend in a large measure on how seriously the U.S. side approaches the disarmament problems in preparing a reply to the Soviet message.

In his radio address to the nation the U.S. President quoted the U.S. READERS DIGEST magazine as saying that the Russians possess or almost possess a "red shield" of strategic anti-ballistic missile defence. Yet we are not preparing such a "red shield", since we consider such a defence to be technologically impossible, destabilizing and dangerous and contravening the Treaty of 1972 on the Limitation of ABM Defence Systems. The now existing system, to which the U.S. side refers, is territorially limited and is permitted under the treaty of 1972. That system does not claim to defend the whole of the USSR's territory. Gennadiy Gerasimov drew attention to publications in the

U.S. press, from which the world has learnt about the holding of specific measures which can be assessed only as practical preparations for nuclear war. The point at issue are the plans to build specially hardened nuclear ammunition depots in close proximity to the landing sites of forward based aircraft at various bases of the U.S. Air Force. Two such depots have already been built at Ramstein Air Base in the FRG. They are to be built at the U.S. bases in Turkey, Britain, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, Greece and South Korea. These plans are fresh proof of the Reagan administration's wish to ensure practical possibilities for the use of American nuclear weapons already at early stages of a military conflict in various theatres of military operations. Above all, the European one. According to the estimates of experts, the programme of building such depots is a fresh step on the way of preparations for nuclear war and is detrimental to arms control, since thus monitoring from satellites of manipulations with nuclear weapons at these bases will be rendered impossible.

Report from Kazakhstan

LD151950 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 15 Jul 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] As previously reported, an agreement has been reached between American and Soviet scientists on conducting joint research in the field of the methods of monitoring nuclear tests. According to the agreement, seismological instruments will be set up close to the nuclear weapons testing grounds in the area of Semipalatinsk and the U.S. state of Nevada. Our correspondent V. Beloborodko presents a report from the area of the Soviet-American experiment in Kazakhstan:

Nearly every working day the American and Soviet scientists begin with a search for the site to set up their instruments. They have to find rocky terrain that will reliably register vibrations in the earth. They find themselves far from the virgin-land roads, and even up in the air. Then they have to split a 100-meter seam and set up their equipment in it. The work is difficult and exhausting, and the mercury in the thermometer goes above 30 degrees celsius. But the scientists are fully determined to do everything expected of them to eliminate the obstacles to ending nuclear tests.

Some of the equipment has already been set up, although, it is true, only on the surface. The American and Soviet specialists each come here several times. They take readings on their instruments and make recordings which are later processed in the laboratory. They are all quick on the uptake with each other. Specialists have their own language. The instruments are noted for their high degree of sensitivity. At our request, someone jumped. And the instrument immediately registered the vibration of the soil. [video shows closeup of some of the seismic equipment, some of it in crates; one has the inscription "Ranger Seismometer Model SS-1 Serial no 140" on it; another "Teledyne Geotech", shot of man in red shirt jumping up and down and the needle registering the vibration]

But when the Americans themselves speak, their sensors record just the music of the moratorium on nuclear explosions the Soviet Union has been maintaining for nearly a year.

There is a lot of work ahead, and that is why the so-called planerka [conference of workers during the implementation of a set plan] of the Soviet and American scientists

is being carried out here in the most businesslike atmosphere, in a specific and concise manner. [video shows scientists working over their instruments in an area surrounded by trees, with a signboard in Russian: "Do not approach! Scientific experiment by United States and USSR scientists in progress;" shot of scientists seated around table in discussion with papers]

Now a few moments for interviews. A question: To what degree can the experiment foster mutual understanding between the USSR and the United States in the field of banning nuclear tests?

[D. Bruin, USA -- identified by screen caption in English with superimposed Russian translation] Mistrust and an absence of mutual understanding between people and peoples often occur when they do not know the truth about each other. In this instance, our task -- as scientists -- lies in helping to establish trust between our countries. We are not politicians. We hope that the results of our work will help them -- the politicians -- to make the right decisions,

[Beloborodko] Well, Oleg Aleksandrovich, you have been listening to that, what would you like to add on this?

[O.A. Stolyarov identified by video caption; wearing blue shirt with legend: "USA-USSR Nuclear Test Ban Verification Team"] Well, I believe that the main task we are tackling in the scientific sense is to achieve in the long term the earliest possible ban -- a complete ban -- on nuclear weapons tests. I believe that this project will be carried out, and I hope that it will be carried out successfully. It will show the public, especially the American public, that today there are no technical questions -- questions connected with the monitoring of this ban -- that should stand in the way of establishing normal mutual understanding, and, in the long term, achieving this main objective.

[Beloborodko] The common opinion is that the scientists are conducting their experiments in a friendly way.

Even today they are doing things together. In the evening they walk around the lake, go boating, and play volleyball. A worthy example for interstate relations between our countries!

Scientists Cited

PM180915 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Jul 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Article for IZVESTIYA by special correspondents V. Itkin and L. Chernenko: "Compromise Moves: Reportage From the Region of the Soviet-U.S. Experiment on Monitoring a Nuclear Test Ban"]

[Text] It is quiet underground, according to the seismogram signed by more than 10 leading Soviet and U.S. scientists taking part in the joint research on monitoring abstention from conducting nuclear tests.

There is a mountainside overgrown with pines. The orange cylindrical seismometers are placed on a rocky terrace. A network of wires runs from them. Metal cases containing instruments stand open on the grass. Alongside stand batteries like bright cubes. Prof James Bruin of the University of California in San Diego, and Igor Leonovich Nersesov,

corresponding member of the Armenian SSR Academy of Sciences, are discussing where the next site should be. Meanwhile, engineers tune the equipment of the various instruments. Technician David (Karrel) and his Soviet colleague understand one another without words -- specialists have their own language of formulas and diagrams. The drum of the register rotates and the magnetic tape moves in the cassettes. A clearing with bright boxes, people on the grass -- it is like some strange picnic. And, indeed, for the scientists such work is like a holiday, a real celebration. A celebration of trust and mutual understanding. The U.S. researchers have not only brought their scientific interests here but also their social and civic stances. They are all active supporters of a nuclear test ban.

Their struggle has brought real results.

"An accord has been reached between U.S. and Soviet scientists on joint research in the sphere of the method of monitoring nuclear tests," said Igor Leonovich Nersesov, chief of the seismology laboratory of the USSR Academy of Sciences Physics of the Earth Institute. "In accordance with this agreement seismic recording centers, equipped with highly sensitive instruments, will be located in Kazakhstan and Nevada. At those centers U.S. and Soviet scientists will conduct joint research aimed at further improving the methods of seismic monitoring."

Therefore, equipment has been installed near Karkaralinsk and test observations and the initial recording are being made. Five An-2 aircraft were needed to bring the equipment here. Now it has been installed and is already working -- registering the tremor of distant earthquakes and the slightest movement of the earth.

"For seismic research this place is ideal -- the noise level is low with outcrops of rock on the surface that reliably relay vibrations," believes U.S. geologist Paul Baldwin.

Tom Cochran, chief geophysicist in charge of seismographs of the U.S. Natural Resources Defense Council, unrolled the first seismogram as though it were a priceless scroll. Authenticated by the signatures of Soviet and U.S. specialists, this is not merely a scientific document but a political document as well. Tom Cochran held it up as a symbol of hope from the rostrum of the International Forum of Scientists for a Nuclear Test Ban, where he flew straight from the experiment site in Kazakhstan.

"The journey from California to Karkaralinsk is a long one. But we made that journey for the sake of important work. The path to the banning of nuclear tests is no easy one, either, but it must be begun for the sake of the future," Tom Cochran said. "Much promising work has successfully begun in Kazakhstan."

"Because of limited resources and numbers of specialists we will not be able to set up seismic stations simultaneously in the United States and the USSR. For that reason we were generously allowed to begin by installing such stations in the Soviet Union. Soviet and U.S. scientists have found complete mutual understanding in their joint work. I would like such mutual understanding to be achieved in politics, too. Like most Americans I hope that the U.S. Administration will join in the moratorium on nuclear explosions, to which the Soviet Union committed itself unilaterally almost 1 year ago. The experiment we are conducting in the Semipalatinsk region will provide clear and objective confirmation of this."

T. Cochran, along with other representatives of the International Forum of Scientists for a Nuclear Test Ban, took part in a meeting with M.S. Gorbachev. At that meeting

the U.S. scientist stated: "I believe that we have completely demolished the arguments put forward by the White House that an all-embracing nuclear test ban treaty is impossible and is not fully verifiable."

"By our work we want to create the best conditions for resolving the problem of banning nuclear weapons and the problem of disarmament," Prof James Bruin of the University of California at San Diego told TASS correspondents. "Our task now is to ensure that the experiment is carried out correctly and produces objective and reliable information. This information is to be used in the interests of disarmament."

"I would like to do everything possible to ensure that relations between the Soviet Union and the United States improve," James Bruin stressed in particular. This is his position as a citizen, a scientist, and a father of four.

"In the experiment zone the scientists are now deciding where the boreholes will be sunk," Igor Leonovich Narsesov said. "In these boreholes permanent equipment will be mounted for seismic recordings. The research program is designed to take 1 year. Sites are being selected for a further two seismic stations to be located. All the information obtained as a result of these observations will be processed and used jointly."

Thus, an important new move has been made by the Soviet Union in the sphere of monitoring the cessation of nuclear tests. The Americans have been given an opportunity to "record" the moratorium. They have been allowed to enter the inner sanctum -- the region adjoining the Soviet test range near Semipalatinsk. Seismic equipment labelled "Made in the U.S.A." has already been installed and is at work there. But will Soviet scientists be given a similar opportunity in Nevada?

"In August the selection of sites for the installation of seismic stations in Nevada will begin," Prof Charles Archambault of the University of Colorado says. "Then Soviet specialists will arrive here. This may take place in the fall."

"U.S. equipment whose potential we know, will be used for the research. This will increase the degree of confidence in the information obtained. It is true that some circles of the government bureaucracy consider our project absurd. But the U.S. scientific community supports it. I have sent letters to many well-known U.S. scientists," Professor Archambault continued, "in an attempt to interest them in our project. Many have already telephoned me and offered every assistance in implementing it. Joint work with our colleagues from the USSR will be useful to us. After all, we know that the potential of Soviet science in these spheres of knowledge is very great."

During our conversation with Professor Archambault we asked his opinion on President Reagan's so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative." [paragraph continues]

"It is not new arms programs that our country needs to launch," the U.S. scientist said, "but an arms control program. The Soviet-U.S. experiment is a promising move in that direction."

When talking about a nuclear test ban the West often complains about the complexity of verification [kontrol]. Nevertheless, in the specialists' opinion, all the necessary technical facilities are now available. Even national seismic stations can establish an accurate picture of all the changes taking place in the earth's crust. The Soviet-U.S. experiment offers new opportunities envisaging joint observations directly on the two countries' territories. This is yet another important instrument for trust.

The Soviet moratorium has been in force for almost 1 year. The Americans can now "record" it directly themselves in the Semipalatinsk region. It is quiet here: the echo of distant earth tremors, the lapping of the waves on the lake, the wind stirring the tree tops, even footsteps on forest paths -- this is all that the highly sensitive U.S. instruments are detecting. They are recording the "music" of the moratorium.

Detect U.S. Test in Nevada

PM211433 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Jul 86 Morning Edition pp 1, 4

[TASS special correspondents V. Itkin, L. Chernenko report for IZVESTIYA: "Alarming Echo: American Seismological Instruments Installed in Kazakhstan Registered the Explosion"]

[Text] The splash of a wave on the lake, a breath of wind swaying the crowns of the treetops, someone's steps on a forest path, the echo of distant earthquakes -- only these were recorded by the sensitive seismometers marked "made in the United States," installed near the Soviet testing range in the region of Semipalatinsk. Ever since the beginning of the Soviet-American experiment in verifying that no nuclear tests are being carried out, the seismograms had shown that no external forces were disrupting the symphony of the depths of the earth.

And then, early in the morning of 18 July local time (in the United States it was Thursday), the American instruments registered an explosion. The Americans themselves who are now in Kazakhstan, observing the characteristic flourish on the seismogram, determined that the explosion had taken place many thousands of kilometers away from the Soviet range, which has been silent for nearly a year, true to the moratorium. The alarming echo of the explosion came from their homeland, from Nevada. And whereas the first seismogram recorded in Kazakhstan was displayed by American scientist Tom Cochran from the International Forum of Scientists for a Nuclear Test Ban to warm applause from all those present, this recording caused entirely different feelings.

Yesterday, the Americans and their Soviet colleagues were doing the "seismologists' dance" in a clearing. The point was that when the scientists had installed the equipment, they had to dance around it to shake the soil. Thus the "seismologists' dance" came about. But today they were not in the mood for dances. Everyone's mood was spoiled. If only it was only the mood. The atmosphere of trust and hope that had been born during the joint work had darkened. While, here in Kazakhstan, Prof James (Bryun) and his colleagues are working at the seismic instruments for the benefit of detente, their compatriots at the Nevada testing range are at the control panels of nuclear devices. What are their thoughts as they press the "atomic" button yet another time?

Last night was not easy for Prof James (Bryun). Not because he was not at home, but in distant Kazakhstan. He could not rest because of what was to happen in Nevada. An hour passed, two, three... Everyone at the instruments here in Karkaralinsk was waiting tensely. All the same, there was the hope: They might cancel it... But early in the morning the dispassionate seismograph picked up an echo of the distant explosion.

That night the Soviet specialists were not feeling "quite themselves" either. It was not very difficult to perceive that James (Bryun), (Brayan Taker), and the young

instruments technician David (Karrel) were simply ashamed to look their Soviet colleagues in the eyes.

"The 14th Nevada explosion since the imposition of the Soviet moratorium is the 1st during the period of joint work by American and Soviet scientists here in Kazakhstan. It smelt of war," O.A. Stolyarov, chief of a laboratory of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Earth Physics, says.

"Today I once again came to believe what I was convinced of as a specialist -- problems of verification of nuclear tests do not exist," (Bryun) said.

The underground echo from Nevada reached Kazakhstan. The new test once again demonstrated that the United States, ignoring the Soviet Union's appeals to join its moratorium, continues to pursue a course of undermining efforts to curb the nuclear arms race. It should be stressed particularly that the new explosion took place almost immediately after the end of the meetings of the International Forum of Scientists for a Nuclear Test Ban in Moscow, at the moment when the Soviet-American experiment had just begun and scientists from the United States had been allowed into the region of the Soviet testing range. But here they had to record only an American nuclear explosion.

There is a special kind of cynicism in all this. The steps we take to meet one another have to be taken on ground shaken by American explosions. The U.S. scientists were not allowed into the Semipalatinsk region in order to record explosions in Nevada.

Addressing American researchers during his meeting with representatives of the International Forum of Scientists for a Nuclear Test Ban, M.S. Gorbachev stressed: "On your part, the fundamental question is that of verification of the ending of tests, verification that tests are not being carried out, and not verification of their continuation and of the improvement of nuclear weapons." But once again, the alarming echo is carried through the ground. The seismic waves travel from Nevada, knowing no borders.

After only 13 minutes, the seismic wave caused by the Nevada explosion crossed the North Pole and reached Kazakhstan, leaving its signature on a seismogram recorded by American instruments.

At 0112 hours and 37 seconds, the echo of the Nevada explosion was also recorded by instruments at the Central Seismic Observatory in Obninsk. This characteristic flourish on the tape cut through many efforts. At the same time it demonstrated that still greater forces must be assembled for the peace offensive.

At the hour the Nevada explosion was planned, our countries were linked by the "Leningrad-Boston" television link-up. People gathered in different studios on different continents in order to become more closely acquainted with each other and talk about what worries everyone -- peace.

But while they were building bridges in Leningrad and Boston, in Nevada they were blowing them up. Purely because of the whims of the weather, the explosion was postponed and did not take place at the moment that people on the two countries were talking about mutual understanding and peace.

The reason was the unfavorable weather. If only these decisions were influenced not only by the natural climate, but also by the international climate. Today that is not at all suitable for nuclear tests, which herald new spirals of the arms race.

...After certain intervals of time, the seismogram tapes are removed from the instruments. There are many of them. It is not difficult for the experts to decipher what the seismographs have recorded. A seismogram is in general very similar to a cardiogram. If a man's pulse beats smoothly and clearly, the cardiogram is normal. A peak or a breaking of the characteristic line means a threat to life, something irremediable could happen.

On 18 July seismic instruments all over the planet recorded a threat to peace and to life.

Only a few days ago, Tom Chocren was displaying a seismogram obtained in Karkaralinsk -- the first, a peaceful, clear graph. There were dozens of autographs on it -- names and surnames in Russian and English.

There are no autographs on the seismogram dated for the morning hours of 18 July. Nobody wanted to sign it. It was signed in Nevada.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1484

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR'S ISRAELYAN DISCUSSES TEST BAN VERIFICATION AT CD

LD221523 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1405 GMT 22 Jul 86

[Text] Geneva, 22 Jul (TASS) -- Verification of the nonuse of nuclear tests remains the focus of attention at the Conference on Disarmament. Speaking at a regular session, V.L. Israelyan, head of the Soviet delegation, touched upon certain aspects of this important problem. The Soviet Union's position is clear, the USSR's representative stressed: We advocate the strictest verification, including on-site inspections and the utilization of all the achievements of seismology. Indicative is the agreement between the USSR Academy of Sciences and the U.S. Natural Resources Defense Council, according to which seismic equipment has been set up by U.S. and Soviet scientists in the Semipalatinsk region.

This once again reaffirms the possibility of mutual verification of a total ban on nuclear tests.

Naturally a major role should be played by the Conference on Disarmament in resolving this problem as work is being carried out within its framework by a special group of expert scientific seismologists. The importance of the work of this group is determined by the fact that there now exists every possibility of discovering any nuclear test with the aid of seismological means of verification. It is well-known that ordinary seismic stations now make it possible to register explosions, even of 20-30 metric tons, at a distance of up to 2,000-3,000 km. Information on registering such explosions is regularly published in bulletins of the international seismological center. The special group of expert scientific seismologists has carried out a number of international technical experiments, the last of which took place in 1984, with 72 stations from 32 states taking part. These experiments confirmed the effectiveness of the procedures that have been elaborated.

However, V.L. Israelyan noted, one must not consider the task facing the group of expert seismologists as concluded. Taking into account the intensive development of equipment for digital registration, equipment for transmitting and processing information in powerful computer centers, as well as the possibility of a wider use of the recordings of signals themselves, or, as they are called, secondary-level data, it is essential to adapt to more intensive research with the aim of using this data in an international seismological exchange.

The USSR's representative stressed that to these ends the Soviet Union proposes that a group of expert seismologists begin developing a system for the efficient transmission of seismic secondary-level data, which would be the basis of international seismic monitoring for a ban on nuclear weapons tests. This data would be transmitted on an ad hoc basis from seismic stations included in the global network using satellite

link channels for processing in international data centers. As well as this, an automated exchange of data between these centers along specially allotted communication channels is envisaged.

The USSR delegation has also proposed carrying out an international experiment on exchanging secondary-level data with the use of both the global system of television communication channels of the World Meteorological Organization and other communication channels. A group of expert seismologists needs to be charged with preparing such an experiment once the time for holding the experiment, for example, 1988, had been chosen.

The words of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee: "We are assisting and will assist Soviet and U.S. scientists in carrying out their initiative with the use of special equipment for monitoring to help ensure no nuclear blasts are carried out" relates to an equal extent to all constructive proposals in this sphere, from wherever they may emanate.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1484

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW 'TOP PRIORITY' DISCUSSES NUCLEAR TEST MORATORIUM

LD212001 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 20 Jul 86

["Top Priority" program, presented by Vladimir Posner, with Drs Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov of the United States of America and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences]

[Excerpts] [Posner] Today we will be looking at what has become one of the most discussed and debated issues in recent months, and that is the issue of a comprehensive nuclear test ban. I'd like us to look at it in connection with the meeting that took place between the general secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev, and scientists who assembled here in Moscow for their forum, scientists for the banning of nuclear tests. And as we talk about this I'd like you and our listeners to keep in mind that just the other day, I believe on Thursday 17th, the United States conducted yet another nuclear test in Nevada.

Now the reason for the forum, for the gathering of these scientists in Moscow, scientists from, I believe, over 30 countries had many reasons [as heard], but perhaps the most important one was the fact that a team of American scientists had gone to Kazakhstan, not far from Semipalatinsk, which is one of the sites where we test nuclear devices, and it installed there seismic equipment, the most modern equipment for on-site verification to show that indeed it was impossible to hide, conceal, disguise any kind of nuclear testing. And that very, very sophisticated technology was installed in this site. Now, that kicks off our discussion.

[Bogdanov] Yes. I think it's very important event and I believe, Vladimir, that you have given us a very comprehensive and very deep analysis what really happened now in Moscow. Let me tell you one thing. You know, I wouldn't like our listeners over there to think that that team of American experts coming to Semipalatinsk, installing these measurements, that's something extraordinary, I would like to tell our listeners that any American Administration, beginning from, even from, I would say, from Kennedy administration, have already known that the technical means, or national technical means are quite enough to detect, to measure and to detect nuclear tests. [passage omitted] But this administration came to power.

[Posner] Do you talk about the Reagan administration?

[Bogdanov] Yes, I mean Reagan administration of course. When they came to power the first thing they said, they said no, we don't believe that. It's not enough, we would like to have on-site inspection as such. We always had a problem with the extent, number one, of such inspection, that it should not mix be up [as heard] with espionage, with (?spy) work. Number one. And number two, we will always would like to have,

you know a correlation, a proper correlation between disarmament measures and control measures because what American side suggested to us in measurement was much higher than arms control (?measure). That's why you always had a suspicion: What for? (?What for you need it?). In any case that's what we saw now, and when I say saw I literally mean that because I saw it by my own eyes on Soviet tv, American tv, nearby that place [words indistinct] sophisticated, you know, measurements and believe me I was full of joy, I was full of enthusiasm that at last, at last we have it, we have it.

[Posner] I'd like to interrupt you for a moment Dr Bogdanov. You said when you began your very impassioned speech, you said that this was nothing outstanding, the fact that the Americans were now putting, had put in this technology, and I tend to agree with you in the scientific sense that there is nothing outstanding. But in my opinion it is outstanding as a reflection of what Mikhail Gorbachev many times now has alluded to as a new way of thinking in a period that demands a completely new approach. Now I would like to ask...

[Bogdanov interrupting] Yes, yes, that's exactly, you're, I just mean that technical side. But from the -- as an event in the Soviet-American relations it's really an event, an extraordinary one.

[Posner] Dr Plekhanov.

[Plekhanov] Yes, I was impressed by the speed with which the idea, which was first broached by the National Resources Defense Council in the United States [as heard], which is an environmentalist organization opposed to the nuclear testing, the way that idea became reality. You would expect that such an idea, the movement of such of an idea, would hit a lot of bureaucratic obstacles and I think the speed with which it was done -- and it's not only American seismologists coming to the Soviet Union, it's an exchange, a group of Soviet seismologists will go to Nevada in a few weeks' time and install Soviet devices [words indistinct].

[Posner] How long did it take from the actual agreement to the installation? Have you any idea?

[Plekhanov] Well, I first heard about it from one of the leaders of the National Resources Defense Council in late March. They were then thinking of putting it forward. Then I believe in May a group from that council came to the Soviet Union and they discussed it with the Committee of Soviet Scientists Against Nuclear War and within a few days they had an agreement.

[Posner] Yes, well actually it took 1 month, from the moment of signing of the agreement to the moment of installing the technology took only 1 month which is really very, very quick.

[Bogdanov] Yes, but this is another proof that technology or all technical difficulties are *?nothing) provided you have a political will to reach results.

[Plekhanov] Absolutely. And this is a conclusion of this conference. The scientists gathered in Moscow discussed in great depth the technical aspects of the verification problem and they literally wiped off the problem, they wiped it off the table. It's no longer a problem. You can't hide behind the bogus thesis that you can't really verify the absence of nuclear testing. So I think that moves forward the test ban, moves us all toward a comprehensive test ban. Of course there will be other arguments put forward because there are people who don't want a nuclear comprehensive test ban and there are some forces in the United States, including those represented in the Reagan administration are very much afraid.

[Posner] Let me catch you on that one. Let us imagine that -- we don't have to imagine it, we know that there are people in the U.S. Administration who do not want a test ban, pretty obviously, they can no longer say that this point that it's not verifiable. If you were one of them, Dr Bogdanov, what argument would you advance to say that we still have to keep on testing?

[Bogdanov] My argument would be that we need improvement and improvements in technological, you know, breakthrough in our nuclear weapons because we believe in deterrence theory and deterrence means what? You always improve your nuclear charges. That would be my argument.

[Posner] And you can't improve them without testing.

[Bogdanov] And you cannot improve it without testing. That's number one. Number two: Gentlemen, we are building up star wars devices, we need for that nuclear power to initiate, you know, to accelerate lasers and things like that and before we do that we should face this and if we are serious about SDI we should do that, that's my argument, and my third argument is don't trust those bloody Russians.

[Posner] Anyway.

[Bogdanov] Anyway.

[Posner] Even if you can verify.

[Bogdanov] Even if you can verify, don't trust those bloody Russians.

[Posner] All right, Professor Plekhanov, I'm not going to ask you to argue with that third one because you can't argue with that. If it's don't trust the Russians then there's no way that we can ever reach any agreement.

But what about those first two? That we have to develop, some Americans might say, we have to develop our strategic arsenals and we have to develop SDI and without testing we can't do it. What would you say to that?

[Plekhanov] Well I would say it's like having a cancer and thinking of improving the way the cancerous cells can do damage to your body. [passage omitted]

[Posner] Here's another question that has come up many times in connection with the installation of this seismic equipment here in the Soviet Union with an American team that will be there for a whole year. There will be American experts manning this equipment for the whole year. One of the questions is, will the Soviet Union exercise forbearance and prolong its unilateral test ban, even if the United States does not follow suit as quickly as we would hope? That is to say, the scientists have been saying 56 percent of the U.S. population today is for a comprehensive test ban. The test ban that the Soviets have adhered to is doing a lot to influence peace. So, even if it doesn't happen today it will happen tomorrow and what they're saying to the Soviet government is, what they asked Mikhail Gorbachev was, please exercise the restraint that you've exercised. What can you say about that?

[Bogdanov] You know, Vladimir, I -- that's my very personal opinion...

[Posner interrupting] Of course.

[Bogdanov] I am not a political level [as heard]. I am not representing a decision-making level, but to be frank with you I am very worried about that. For 1 year we have been not testing. If we don't do that and if Americans snap their fingers at our, you know, gesture, believe me or not I would have to go ahead with our testing.

[Posner] You would, eh?

[Bogdanov] I would, I would. I am very worried, I am very worried, I am very worried. Of course, you may say that unilateral gesture, very, very appealing, very...

[Posner, interrupting] Important.

[Bogdanov] Morally important, but that's my personal opinion, you may not agree with that.

[Posner] Sure.

[Bogdanov] But I am very worried and I believe that many, many Soviets share my views. What do you think, Sergey?

[Posner] How about you?

[Plekhanov] Yes, I think that with this continuing [words indistinct] there will be technical problems that people could point to, and the important thing is that this initiative of ours is met, is reciprocated by the American side. So this is a question where the American people and their elected representatives can have a real say, can have a real impact. We are holding out in our restraint. We have held out for longer than anybody expected. But I would agree with Dr Bogdanov that there will be problems of a military-technical nature if the United States continues its mindless rush toward more and more and better and better nuclear weapons.

[Posner] Well, Mikhail Gorbachev said that the point is that we are not testing, that we will not test until 6 August, which does give the United States more time, and that the Soviet leadership would seriously consider this request on the part of the scientists. But I tend to share your view that we cannot go on for ever, there has to be some -- I mean if, if the United...

[Plekhanov interrupting] There has to be a response.

[Posner] If the U.S. leadership, if the U.S. Administration is going to ignore what the majority of Americans want, what the majority of the world wants, I don't think anyone -- I don't think if you were to conduct a poll the world over you would have any doubt that the overwhelming majority would be demanding a comprehensive test ban. If the U.S. Government is going to continue ignoring that desire on the part of the majority of the human race, I don't think we'll have any choice at some point, although I would certainly hope, and I think that the fact that we have reached this nongovernmental agreement on the installation of these techniques and technologies that make it absolutely foolproof that no one can test without the other side knowing, it gives me a certain amount of hope that indeed a comprehensive test ban will be agreed upon. Now, do you have that hope yourselves as we close this program or not? Be quite frank, I'd like to hear your feelings.

[Bogdanov] I -- again I would like to be quite frank. I am not 100 percent sure. My percentage rather is very low.

[Posner] I see. How about you?

[Plekhanov] No, I do have hope and I do hope that there is enough common sense in the American people to have a say in this problem. And I think that is the key question, as to whether democracy works in America, to any extent, whether what the people think counts, whether madness in nuclear affairs completely reigns in the United States. That's the question. I tend to be a little more on the optimistic side on those questions.

[Posner] Well, it's clear that in the near future we are going to hear the answers to a lot of those questions and we'll be discussing them in the future as well. So, for today, I want to say goodbye for the team of Top Priority. Tune in next week, the same time and the same day for our next issue.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1484

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: U.S. 17 JULY NEVADA TEST ASSAILED

U.S. Opposition Noted

LD172216 Moscow TASS in English 2200 GMT 17 Jul 86

["Another Nuclear Test in Nevada" -- TASS item identifier]

[Text] Washington July 17 TASS -- TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko reports:

Another test of nuclear weapons with a yield from 20 to 150 kilotons was conducted at the test site in Nevada today. This is the 14th [as received] test conducted by the USA since the Soviet Union announced on August 6, 1985 a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions. This confirms the United States adherence to the nuclear arms race. Ignoring the Soviet Union's call for joining in the moratorium and protests of the public in all countries and in the United States itself, refusing to heed the warning of specialists who point out that this race leads to the escalation of the threat of nuclear catastrophe, the administration arrogantly declares its intention to continue the program of nuclear testing.

This was stated by representatives of the White House and the Department of State before the new explosion in Nevada. Their pronouncements confirmed again that the USA has no wish to heed the voice of reason, to join in the Soviet moratorium and show without delay a constructive approach to the question of concluding a treaty on a comprehensive test ban. An end to all test of nuclear weapons would contradict the interests of the United States security, said a spokesman for the Department of State.

Prominent American specialists declare against such assertions. Among them are former Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, diplomat and historian George Kenna, authoritative experts in the sphere of arms control Gerard Smith and Paul Warnke, retired admirals Gene Larocque and Eugene Carroll, and such mass American public organizations as the Union of Concerned Scientist, Women Strike for Peace and many others, a great number of U.S. congressmen. They warn that the upgrading of existing types of nuclear arms and development of new ones undermines international security, and, hence, the United States security.

Sane politicians and public leaders, and experts are unanimous in the opinion that particular danger for entire humanity, including the United States itself, is posed by "star wars" program worked out by the United States which envisages the emplacement in space of arms systems based on the principle of the use of nuclear energy. Nevertheless, the components of these systems have already been tested more than once at the range in Nevada. Many people in the USA also point to the fact that no one can guarantee that the computers which become ever more complicated and which are used for controlling the latest arms systems will not make an error. Those who know contemporary technology are aware of the fact that it cannot function ideally. This is recognized, for instance, by former astronaut, participant in the flight to the moon Michael Collins.

Nevertheless the administration, as the latest explosion in Nevada shows, is winding up the clock of atomic death. Time is running out and less and less opportunities remain for taking joint radical and effective measures to curb the arms race.

Soviet Stand Reiterated

LD182203 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 18 Jul 86

[Viktor Levin commentary]

[Text] A nuclear weapons test has been carried out at the U.S. site in Nevada. The power of the device exploded is approximately equal to the power of the U.S. atom bomb dropped on Hiroshima. Here is a commentary; Viktor Levin is at the microphone:

The latest nuclear explosion is the seventh this year and the 14th [as heard] since the Soviet Union introduced its unilateral moratorium on conducting nuclear tests. It is noteworthy that almost all the world's information services are drawing attention to this fact. By way of example, let me refer to the West German agency DPA and the U.S. UPI. An identical phrase figures in their wires: The United States is continuing its nuclear tests despite the unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions, which is in effect until 6 August. You must agree: The actual comparison between the positions of the USSR and the United States on this issue sounds like a reproach against the U.S. Administration. The Soviet Union's position shows unequivocally that our country is ready to go as far as necessary in order to put an end to nuclear explosions. Clear and convincing evidence of this was the agreement between the USSR Academy of Sciences and the U.S. Natural Resources Defense Committee, according to which U.S. scientists have already established special equipment for seismic research in the Semipalatinsk area where Soviet nuclear tests used to be carried out.

Thomas Cochran, the chief geophysicist of the aforementioned committee, said the following at a recent meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and representatives of the International Forum of Scientists for a Nuclear Test Ban: I think we have completely demolished the arguments put forward by the White House that a comprehensive treaty for banning nuclear tests is supposed to be impossible and does not lend itself to full verification. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev answered to this that we are of the same opinion.

The U.S. Administration, however, continues its dangerous play with nuclear fire. Evidence of this is the latest nuclear explosion and the statement by Assistant U.S. Secretary of Defense Richard Perle, branded the mouthpiece of Washington hawks, that the initiative of the U.S. Natural Resources Defense Committee is absurd and plays into the Soviet Union's hands. Other office administration representatives also repeat that the

United States will talk about verification of tests and not verification of a test ban. All this time, the consistent, clear, and extremely honest policy of the Soviet Union is bearing its fruits. Our country will not veer from this policy.

Understanding that human civilization will not survive a nuclear war, the Soviet Union is full of resolve to do everything necessary in order to prevent it. This is also reflected in the proposals for the elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000 and in such practical deeds as introducing a unilateral moratorium and agreeing to the installation of U.S. seismic equipment in the Semipalatinsk area.

U.S., Soviet Stances Contrasted

LD200158 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 19 Jul 86

[Valentin Zorin commentary]

[Excerpts] When Washington refused to follow the Soviet Union's example and suspend all nuclear tests, it gave Americans and the world at large a chance to look deep into administration policies. At first the administration tried to weaken the impact of the Soviet moratorium on underground tests by claiming such a move would have little effect. But very soon independent minded people came to realize that stopping nuclear testing would do much to stop the nuclear arms race, since without tests no new systems can be developed. Next, Washington tried the argument of verification, claiming that Moscow was opposed to reliable means of verification, whereupon the Soviet leadership announced it would agree to a reliable system of international control, including on-site inspection. [passage omitted] But again Washington refused to budge.

Earlier this week, however, a group of prominent scientists of various countries gathered in Moscow to discuss the problem of banning nuclear tests, and among them were Prof von Hippel, of Princeton University, and the chief geophysicist on seismology of the United States Committee for the Defense of Natural Resources, Professor Cochran. American experts also set up verification equipment of sites they themselves chose, having received immediate permission from the Soviet authorities to do so. And, according to Cochran, they have already obtained the first seismic readings from Karkaralinsk, a site about 200 km west of the spot where the Soviet Union used to conduct nuclear weapons tests. Note that the Soviet Union has again acted unilaterally in allowing American experts to install equipment for on-site inspection. If it were planning secret tests, would it grant such permission? [passage omitted]

Worldwide Condemnation Noted

LD201425 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 20 Jul 86

[Vladimir Pasko commentary]

[Text] News reports continue to be received from Madrid, Ottawa, and other capitals about public indignation over the latest U.S. explosion. In the United States anti-war organizations are launching a campaign aimed at getting Congress to halt appropriations for conducting nuclear tests. Here is our commentator Vladimir Pasko:

The U.S. nuclear tests, being conducted while the Soviet Union has not tested any for almost 1 year, are evoking anger and indignation throughout the entire civilized world. Washington's demonstrated unwillingness to follow the Soviet example at the same time raises at least two questions. First, why is the United States adopting such a stance? Second, what is to be done further in the situation that has been created? It seems that everything is quite simple regarding the reason for the stance.

What has been done over the 6 years of government by the present U.S. Administration has delineated its political face in such detail that nothing can any longer hide its militarist essence. The U.S. press has been anxiously saying that to this day the President's actions show no striving to reach an agreement with the Soviet Union on arms control.

Taking account of the change soon in the White House incumbency, the CHICAGO TRIBUNE stated in an editorial on 28 June, it is necessary now to think of what should be undertaken in the meantime by Congress to prepare for the moment when the United States wishes once more to seriously negotiate.

Regarding what is to be done further in the situation that has been created, one will scarcely find a realistic person who does not understand that, if one country continues to prepare for war, the other cannot view this with indifference. While sharply protesting the latest explosion in Nevada, the public in all continents has been looking with alarm and hope in the direction of the Soviet Union to see whether the latter will renounce compliance with the moratorium it declared until 6 August. There is no evidence of such an intention. The Soviet Union, with characteristic restraint, is continuing to wait for a positive response to its initiative.

As you know, our country's position is receiving high recognition everywhere, and it could not be otherwise. The position is in accord with the aspirations and attitudes of all mankind. At the same time it creates firm support for the most active part of mankind that is marching in the ranks of the peace movement. The actions of the U.S. peace supporters, who are now launching a campaign to remove the money allocated for the conducting of nuclear explosions from the country's budget, can only be welcomed. The struggle to halt nuclear tests is continuing.

U.S. Media Ignore Event

PM211515 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jul 86 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent G. Vasilyev dispatch: "'They Kept the Nuclear Explosion Secret...' How the U.S. Mass Media 'Failed to Notice' the Latest Test in Nevada"]

[Text] New York, 20 Jul -- "All the news that is fit to print" -- this is the proud inscription on the front page of THE NEW YORK TIMES. It implies that one of the leading U.S. newspapers informs its readers about all noteworthy events.

But what, nonetheless, does THE NEW YORK TIMES actually print, and what does it not print? I pick up the 18 July issue. A very weighty newspaper. Some 94 pages, no less. It will take at least an hour just to leaf through and give the paper a cursory glance.

I turn a page and learn something that gives an additional insight into the present times and mores: The large LTV steel company has gone bankrupt. One more associate of New York Mayor Koch has been found guilty of taking bribes. These are among the "lead" stories. On the inside pages there are all kinds of things: a piquant medley of reports on murders, fashion, the spread of the AIDS disease, gangsters' "exploits," and politicians' statements. And advertisements, advertisements, advertisements...

I endeavor to find additional information on what I learned the day before yesterday, when I telephoned the American Peace Test antiwar organization in Nevada -- on the latest nuclear test. Nothing, not a single line. It is though there had not been an

explosion. It turns out that this event, which spread alarming ripples throughout the world, does not merit publication in the respectable American newspaper.

Perhaps other newspapers acted differently? I waste no time in looking attentively through THE WASHINGTON POST, the NEW YORK DAILY NEWS, and the NEW YORK POST. The same thing -- not one line. Evidently these publication also consider the news of the latest nuclear explosion "not fit to print." The proprietors of the "free press" have evidently decided not to worry the Americans, not to alarm them at the weekend (days off) with unpleasant news.

The English language has the expression "blackout," meaning "darkness," "concealment," "keeping secret." And it is to such "secrecy" that the U.S. mass media have recently been subjecting the carrying out of nuclear explosions in Nevada. [paragraph continues]

This is particularly obvious because only a few months ago the same NEW YORK TIMES and WASHINGTON POST were sure to carry a report on this the day before the upcoming test and the day after. Television companies also invariably mentioned this in the latest news. Now it is all different. Why?

The answer suggests itself. Americans are alarmed. Increasingly broad public circles advocate that the Reagan administration stop the nuclear explosions and subscribe to the Soviet moratorium. This is demanded by representatives of public organizations, religious figures, scientists, and doctors. Indignation is beginning to grip a section of Congress, where there is soon to be a vote on a resolution providing for an end to appropriations for nuclear tests unless Washington subscribes to Moscow's moratorium. The administration's positions are becoming morally vulnerable. And so the bosses of the mass media have decided "not to notice" the nuclear explosion, which was so powerful that, as they say, the floors and walls shook in buildings in Las Vegas, where these very bosses and other "bosses" of America so love to gamble at roulette.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1484

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS: U.S. NUCLEAR TESTING IN MICRONESIA ASSAILED AT UN

LD132338 Moscow TASS in English 2259 GMT 13 May 86

/Text/ New York 14 May TASS--TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Chernyshev reports:

The neverending pain and suffering of the generations of Micronesians, the stories of their unhealing nuclear wounds filled on Tuesday the chamber of the UN Trusteeship Council which continued to examine the developments in the trust territories of the Pacific Islands.

The petitioners from Bikini, Enewetak, Palau and other territories told the world body about the horrors of the blatantly inhumane and cruel nuclear testing programme conducted by Washington which had cynically turned the trust territory into a nuclear weapons testing ground and the population of Micronesia into guinea pigs.

Jonathan M. Weisgall, legal counsel to the people of Bikini, told the Trusteeship Council that the soil of Bikini Island remains contaminated even today after the scores of atomic and hydrogen bombs the United States tested there between 1946 and 1958. A cleanup and resettlement is not even close to reality. Indeed, the budget for fiscal 1987 sent by Present Reagan to Congress provides no funds for these programs. This year marks the 40th anniversary of the removal of the Bikinians from their homeland and of the first postwar atomic tests there. Forty years later, Bikini Island is still not fit for habitation and the Bikinians remain exiles from their homeland. The story, sadly, has no ending.

Glenn H. Alcalay from the National Committee for Radiation Victims noted that when military planners in Washington had chosen Bikini as an atomic sacrifice area it was the Bikini people themselves who were the very last to learn of the decision to turn their atoll and lagoon into a nuclear battleground. Only in 1978, 20 years after the cessation of nuclear testing, the Bikini islanders succeeded in forcing the United States to conduct a radiological survey of the northern Marshalls. The survey concluded that the radiological contamination of the Marshall Islands was far more extensive than had been previously revealed as a result of the 66 (announced) atomic and hydrogen bomb tests. According to the Department of Energy report, all 14 atolls and islands surveyed had received fallout.

Whether the U.S. Government actually planned in advance to intentionally use the Marshall islanders as human "guinea pigs" in studies of radioactive fallout effects may never be fully disclosed, Glenn Alcalay said. However, the fact that the United States did not take adequate and humane precautions to prevent the possible irradiation of human beings was certainly the order of the day.

Speaking on behalf of the people and Council of Enewetak Atoll, David Anderson of a Washington, D.C. law firm, said that the nuclear test program of the Pentagon had damaged the atoll so much that it would never be the same as before the day when the United States took it to use for thermonuclear tests in violation of the trusteeship agreement. He emphasized that the United States had yet to be fully accountable for this act of high international trespass.

William Butler, representative of the Minority Rights Group, denounced the U.S. striving for altering the political will of the people of Palau--the only Micronesian state with a nuclear-free constitution. This runs counter to the norms of international law and commitments of the trusteeship agreement. He pointed out that the U.S. militaristic nuclear plans in the Pacific were at variance with the ever stronger demands of the population of that region that the Pacific Basin be turned into a nuclear-free zone.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1484

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR'S KAPITSA INTERVIEWED ON MONITORING ISSUE

LD191805 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 1400 GMT 19 Jul 86

[Interview with Sergey Kapitsa, professor of physics and head of the USSR delegation to the Budapest consultation of international scientists, by Istvan Kulcsar for the "168 Hours" program; Kapitsa speaking in Russian with superimposed Hungarian translation; date and place not given -- recorded]

[Text] The scientists of 10 countries are conferring in Budapest about the social causes and effects of nuclear armament.

The general secretary of the international organization of scientists struggling against nuclear arms at the opening of the conference said that the world is not united in its assessment of the world political situation, the danger inherent in nuclear weapons. For this reason it is extremely important that the experts, on the other hand, make a united stand and that they express their opinions about the causes of the arms race and the possibilities of its being halted. Sergey Kapitsa, professor of physics, who heads the Soviet delegation at the Budapest consultation of the international scientists' organization, which has its headquarters in London, and who in his speech talked about the most important political, military, technical problems, has given an interview to "168 Hours." First of all Istvan Kulcsar recalled a press conference that was held in Moscow at the start of the week, where an announcement was made that caused a worldwide stir.

[Kulcsar] Professor Kapitsa, Hungarian public opinion continues to be occupied with the Chernobyl accident. Not so much now with the details of what happened, rather with the conclusions. This was naturally only an insignificantly minor catastrophe compared to that which could be caused by the explosion of a nuclear device with a military objective, a nuclear bomb. Nevertheless, what conclusions can and should scientists draw from this, by all those who are troubled by the state of the world today?

[Kapitsa] This really was a very brutal lesson. You are right, only a certain quantity of radiation was released here. A nuclear bomb, apart from the radiation, also devastates with a wave of explosions, with a colossal conflagration. In connection with Chernobyl, many people in our country are of the view that the accident was a very severe warning regarding the fact that the new technology, the new level of energy concentration, the new level of taking possession of the forces of nature, demands much more discipline, preparedness, and organization. That is to say, the utilization, exploitation, of these forces. This is one of the principal lessons we have to draw from what happened in Chernobyl. It is important that this applies not only to energy systems; but for example to aviation, navigation, to every type of enormous, modern, concentration of energy. Let us take for example a barrage among the hills. That also concentrates a huge amount of energy and if it is badly built, if it is incorrectly operated, it could become the source of an enormous catastrophe.

[Kulcsar] Allow me to go on to a completely different topic.

In Soviet Kazakhstan, in the vicinity of the Semipalatinsk nuclear experimental site, in a zone where foreigners never used to be allowed to go, not long ago an American station started to function with the purpose of observing possible underground nuclear explosions. These have been suspended now, but in principle they could be renewed, could they not? What is the purpose of this experiment and how will it continue?

[Kapitsa] This experiment came about on the basis of the agreement that the Soviet Academy of Sciences concluded with an influential American environmental protection organization. Its objective is not to control nuclear explosion tests. On the contrary. It is to prove that it is possible to control the ending of explosions. The American equipment was set up 200 kilometers from the site of the earlier Soviet nuclear experiments. This makes it possible for the U.S. scientists to get to know in the given zone the circumstances of the spreading of land movements, the geological pollution of the zone. This is as a matter of fact a tolerably calm region from the seismological point of view, but the instruments are extremely sensitive and daily register 10-15 tiny earthquakes. On this basis it is possible to draw conclusions about the zone's geological structure and seismological peculiarities, so that if at any time in the future the observation of the banning of underground nuclear tests in the Soviet Union will be controlled, the data thus acquired may serve as a basis for this activity.

I stress that the afore mentioned agreement is based on the principle of reciprocity. The Soviet scientists, on the other hand, will naturally only work in the United States, in the zone of Nevada nuclear experimental site, when the explosions there are stopped. The agreement in essence serves the control of the observation of the moratorium. The American side, on the other hand, has so far unfortunately not declared a moratorium on underground nuclear explosions.

[Kulcsar] Are we to understand it, professor, that as long as the United States does not declare a moratorium, the Soviet scientists will not go to Nevada to make observations?

[Kapitsa] Yes, I think that until that happens it would be meaningless to conduct such activity there.

[Kulcsar] Therefore, the scientists should control not the explosions, but the absence of explosions, their cessation?

[Kapitsa] It is well-known that the American side has always alluded to the lack of on-the-spot control as a factor which obstructs the signing of the agreement proclaiming the total ban on nuclear experiments. This present experiment, this agreement, testifies that no such obstacle exist any more, not even in the most factitious situation.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1484

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

PRC PRESS CITES KOREAN STATEMENT ON U.S. NUCLEAR ARMORIES

HK211119 Beijing RENMIN RIBAO in Chinese 18 Jul 86 p 6

[Special dispatch from Pyongyang on 16 July, by correspondent Xu Baokang "KOREAN CENTRAL NEWS AGENCY Authorized To Make a Statement Denouncing the United States for Preparing To Build Nuclear Arsenals in South Korea"]

[Text] The KOREAN CENTRAL NEWS AGENCY was today authorized to make a statement, strongly denouncing the United States for planning to build some special armories of nuclear weaponry in the Kunsan area of South Korea.

It has been reported that the United States is now planning to build 36 underground armories of nuclear weapons in the Kunsan area of South Korea. The special armories, which are code-named as "WS3," are equipped with nuclear weapons and "quick take-off" attack fighters. These fighters are on a 24-hour alert and can take off within 15 minutes. A spokesman of U.S. Armed Forces said: "The information concerning the stockpile and capacity of nuclear weapons is an open secret."

The statement denounced the building of these nuclear weapon armories in South Korea by the United States as an intolerable crime of making nuclear war preparations and attempting to lead our country to nuclear disasters. The statement called for an immediate stop to the nuclear war preparations and for a positive response to the proposal put forward by Korea for holding talks on turning the Korean peninsula into a peace and nonnuclear zone.

The statement said that seeking a peaceful settlement of the Korea issue by means of dialogue and consultation is the common wish of the Korean people and the world peace-loving people as well. In the International Peace Year, the Korean people will spare no effort to eradicate the nuclear war threat on the Korean peninsula and the safeguard the peace and security achieved there with the active support and solidarity of the world peace-loving people.

/12858

CSO: 5200/4059

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

BRIEFS

TASS CITES U.S. VETERANS--Kishkinv, 22 July TASS--Veterans of the Second World War, residing in Moldavia, a republic in the south of the USSR, today sent a letter to U.S. President Ronald Reagan. They write that they would never forget the horrors of the war, its last days when barbarous nuclear weapons were tested on Hiroshima and Nagasaki residents. "Why haven't you yet joined the moratorium on nuclear explosions to make our world, as you like to say, 'a safer place to live'? Our country has not been conducting such explosions for almost a year now. The United States held 14 tests over that time, and the latest--just a few days ago". The former soldiers call upon the United States to hold no tests of nuclear explosions as of August 6 and traverse its part of the way towards the USSR at the negotiations on disarmament. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1626 GMT 22 Jul 86 LD] /12858

CSO: 5200/1484

RELATED ISSUES

USSR: REPORTS, COMMENTS ON SHEVARDNADZE VISIT TO BRITAIN

UK Political Scene Viewed

PM141453 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jul 86 First Edition p 4

[PRAVDA correspondent A. Maslennikov report: "In Search of Their Own 'Identity'"]

[Test] London, July -- Recently I happened to observe an unusual picture: Members of both houses of Parliament and prominent figures in science, culture, and public life formed a waiting line not far from the Westminster Palace in order to add their signatures to a huge poster carrying an appeal for an end to the production, testing, and deployment of nuclear weapons. The propaganda poster, fixed to the side of a double-decker bus, set off on a tour of 100 of the country's cities and industrial centers so as to convey the clear, precise appeal to ordinary English people.

Commenting on this event, the British newspapers noted that both the nature of the ceremony and the unusually broad spectrum of participants (the poster was signed by politicians of all hues, from labor to conservative) testify to the important changes now taking place in the mood of Britons and the people of other West European countries.

Today it is not only professional politicians, but millions of ordinary people in various countries of the world who are beginning to look increasingly carefully at the actions of states and governments, assessing them according to the most important criterion: how they influence the general development of the international situation, whether they push mankind further and further toward the brink of self-destruction or whether, on the contrary, they offer him the prospect of creating a world without wars, a world without weapons.

An example is provided by the international reaction to the U.S. President's statement at the end of May on his intention to stop observing the Soviet-American SALT II treaty, which was a challenge to all peace-loving mankind against the background of the Soviet Union's new constructive initiatives. This step caused profound concern not only in progressive public circles throughout the world, but also, apparently, among the most loyal U.S. allies in the NATO bloc.

"I do not think I will be giving away a great secret if I say that the majority of West European politicians today feel angry about President Reagan's intention of renouncing the observance of commitments under SALT II," James Eberle, director of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, told me. "There is a real danger that as a result of this step the very foundations of the system of treaties which oblige both sides to show restraint in the arms race will be destroyed."

Analyzing the U.S. Administration's actions, many West European observers note that they create increasing difficulties for relations within NATO. "Whatever you look at: Reagan's 'star wars' project, the decision to site cruise missiles and Pershing's in Europe, or the American attack on Libya -- the problems jeopardizing the relationship between the United States and Western Europe continue to snowball," political observer J. Steele writes in THE GUARDIAN newspaper.

The U.S. allies on this side of the Atlantic are talking more and more about the so-called European aspect of ensuring security. Their desire to play a role independent of Washington in world politics is becoming increasingly evident. In Britain, where for historical reasons the economic and military ties with the transatlantic partner have always been and still are very close, such a search for their own "identity" is particularly complex and at times contradictory.

British foreign policy, based on the two key points of maintaining "special relations" with the senior American partner and possessing its own nuclear potential, has always contained profound contradictions. Devised in the first postwar years as a means of maintaining Britain's prestige and influence as a world power, with the passage of time it has led to a sharp intensification in London's military and political dependence on Washington. The British Isles found themselves strewn with American military bases whose personnel are virtually beyond the control of the British Government.

Nobody can be misled by the so-called "independent" status of the British nuclear submarine fleet, equipped with Polaris missiles. These missiles, like the Tridents being prepared to replace them, are an integral part of the NATO military structure. They are included in the overall plan for strikes against vitally important centers on the territory of the USSR and the other socialist countries.

The dangerous nature of the situation that has emerged became particularly apparent when the present administration came to power in the United States and the aggressiveness of Washington's foreign policy sharply increased. This was clearly demonstrated by the U.S. Libyan adventure, in which Britain was an accomplice. The admission made after the fact by the British head of government that she "simply could not refuse" the Americans use of the F-111 bombers based at British airfields for the attack on Libya confirmed what the country's progressive circles had long been giving warnings about: Britain's present political and military dependence on its American ally could drag the Britons into a war against their will. This admission caused political shock to many inhabitants of the British Isles. Public opinion polls carried out immediately after the bombing of Libya showed that more than two-thirds of Britons resolutely condemn both the Reagan administration's actions and the support they received from the Thatcher government.

The USSR's peace-loving policy is a powerful catalyst in the reinterpretation of Britain's role in European and world affairs. Britons, like the other West Europeans, cannot help make comparisons; while statements and actions whipping up fever in the international atmosphere and threatening to take the arms race into a still higher orbit come from Washington one after another, Moscow has put forward a series of initiatives, in the first 6 months of this year alone, which open the way to curb this race in all its main avenues. British public and political circles received with great interest the concrete proposals put forward by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee at his meeting with members of a British parliamentary delegation in Moscow, proposals aimed at ensuring the two countries' mutual security in the nuclear sphere, as well as his observation that great opportunities exist for the development of fruitful political dialogue between the USSR and Britain, economic and cultural ties, and contacts between people.

This is prompting more and more British politicians to take a new look at the nature and prospects of Soviet-British relations and the potential for cooperation between the two countries both bilaterally and internationally.

The new trend was manifested particularly clearly during the discussion of the country's foreign policy which took place in the British Parliament on 18 June of this year. In the existing international situation, when American foreign policy is so confused and contradictory, Labor "shadow" foreign secretary D. Healy said in the course of the debate, Britain could play a constructive role in achieving a USSR-U.S. agreement. The British Government, he noted, has the opportunity to make a positive contribution, in particular, in such spheres as the banning of weapons, the attainment of an accord on a complete and universal nuclear test ban, and exerting pressure on the United States with a view to preventing the militarization of space.

As is known, the Labor Party leadership also supported the Soviet Union's proposal for an equivalent reduction in Soviet nuclear potential in the event that Britain officially adopts a decision to eliminate its nuclear weapons. "The readiness expressed by the Soviet Union to reduce nuclear arms on a mutual basis," party leader N. Kinnock stated, "is a very important and correct step in the direction of nuclear disarmament."

Calls for the expansion of constructive Soviet-British dialogue with a view to improving the international atmosphere are today emanating not only from the opposition camp. In the course of parliamentary debates interest was aroused by a speech by P. Temple-Morris, member of the House of Commons for the ruling Conservative Party, who recently visited our country with a parliamentary delegation. "I am absolutely convinced," he stated, "that the Soviet Union is sincere in its desire for peace and dialogue. I say this in all sincerity. We are dealing with tough people who live under a different system, and the path ahead will not be easy. Difficult talks await us, but I believe that the Soviet leaders' motives are sincere and we should meet them halfway."

A. Beith, a representative of the Liberal Party, called in the course of the debate for the strengthening of constructive principles in Britain's foreign policy and the lessening of its dependence on Washington. "I believe," he said, "that many of President Reagan's foreign policy actions increase the danger which hangs over us. That is why I would like to see a more decisive affirmation of the British view on many issues, including East-West relations and arms control."

Judging from official British Government statements published in the press, the government has not yet finally defined its attitude to the wide range of Soviet disarmament proposals. It continues to fluctuate between the Tories' traditional pro-American course and the desire to play a more active, independent role in world affairs. For instance, in Parliament Foreign Secretary G. Howe declared the government's desire to limit the arms race and help improve East-West relations. [paragraph continues]

But, this statement does not tie in at all with the subsequent tests of a British nuclear device at the American testing range in Nevada and London's ostentatious support for Reagan's "star wars" program.

The history of Soviet-British relations has gone through various stages in its development. There have been periods of tension and times -- quite long times -- when cooperation between the two states has brought considerable benefit both to their own peoples and to the entire world community. There have been examples of such cooperation in the comparatively recent past, when representatives of the two countries worked jointly on the elaboration of such important international agreements as the Treaty

Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the three environments, the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and others. There are no insuperable obstacles to the development of such cooperation in future. Only one thing is needed -- political will on both sides, consideration of the true interests of the Soviet and British peoples, and a desire not in words, but in deeds to strive to lessen East-West tension and ensure a peaceful future for mankind.

Shevardnadze Arrival Statement

LD131940 Moscow TASS in English 1938 GMT 13 Jul 86

[Text] London, July 13 TASS -- Eduard Shevardnadze, a member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, has arrived here today at the invitation of the Government of Great Britain. He was welcomed at the airport by Timothy Renton, minister of state for foreign and commonwealth affairs, Michael John Llewellyn Smith, chief of the Soviet Department at the Foreign Office, and Leonid Zamyatin, the Soviet Union's ambassador to Britain.

Eduard Shevardnadze made the following statement upon arrival:

"We are grateful to Her Majesty's Government for the invitation. During our short stay in the United Kingdom, we hope to conduct mutually beneficial substantial talks. We consider them a continuation of a new stage of the Soviet-British dialogue, started by the visit of Mikhail Gorbachev to your country in December 1984.

"During the talks with Prime Minister Thatcher, with my colleague Sir Geoffrey and other British politicians we intend to have an exchange of views on the main problems of the world politics, first of all -- on the issues of security, lowering the international tension, reducing the military threat. For us it would be important to get a clear idea of the British position regarding the complex of proposals put forward by the Soviet Union in this field and to try to lay a foundation for a constructive cooperation in the future. Of course we are aware of the obstacles on the way to mutual understanding, but we believe that common goodwill of our two countries, governments and peoples is capable to overcome them.

"We also have points to be discussed in the field of the bilateral ties, which are extremely important in the context of East-West relations. I believe that the British people are as much sincere in wishing their improvement as the peoples of the Soviet Union. An experience of history shows that the peoples of our countries were to gain a lot whenever climate of confidence and cooperation existed between Russia and England, between the Soviet Union and Great Britain.

"We are looking forward to see the native land of Shakespeare and Newton, Dickens and Shaw, Gainsborough and Britten, the country which had made such a great contribution to the human civilization.

"I would like on this occasion to convey our wishes of happiness, peace and well-being to the residents of London, indeed to all the British people."

Commentary on Relations

LD132202 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 13 Jul 86

[Nikolay Gorshkov commentary]

[Text] The Soviet foreign minister's visit comes as the climax of a series of high-level contacts between our two countries. There have been highly useful visits to Britain by the head of the Soviet agro-industrial complex, Vsevolod Murakhovskiy, and Soviet general staff spokesman, General Chervov, and a top expert on disarmament with the Soviet Foreign Ministry, Viktor Israelyan. These visits led the BBC to conclude that the Soviet leadership is genuinely interested in the positive development of Anglo-Soviet relations, while the Soviet side has certainly never made a secret of its desire to live in peace and to cooperate with all countries and with those in Europe in particular. This desire of ours was stressed recently at the highest possible level during the talks between Mikhail Gorbachev and Francois Mitterrand. The Soviet leader reaffirmed Moscow's determination to seek solutions to international problems on the basis of the principles of reasonable compromise and equal security. The whole package of the latest Soviet peace initiatives, which President Mitterrand described as quite sensational, has this very aim.

Quite a few of those proposals concern Britain directly. They include proposals for a comprehensive ban on nuclear tests, for deep cuts in conventional and chemical weapons in Europe and for a considerable lowering of nuclear force levels in terms of both strategic and intermediate arms.

British officials are reported by REUTER as viewing the current visit by the Soviet foreign minister as an important component in accelerating East-West dialogue which, they hope, could break the impasse over arms control and pave the way to a second Soviet-American summit. For such hopes to come true, there has to be a genuine expression of political will on the part of the Western allies for earnest discussion of the Soviet arms control proposals. As Mikhail Gorbachev and Francois Mitterrand agreed, specific and persistent differences of opinion should not preclude a search for points of agreement. Indeed, there is an urgent need for every country in Europe and elsewhere to state clearly and resolutely its desire for dialogue and peace. And not only that, but to act in this direction. There could be a major breakthrough in this field if the West European governments convinced Washington of the need to respect existing agreements restraining the arms race and to prevent its spread to outer space. Washington's intention of correcting the SALT treaties appears to be the major obstacle to a summit and Britain as America's closest ally could do much to alleviate the situation. European countries, said President Mitterrand, have the political clout to make their voice heeded.

It was agreed on the final day of President Mitterrand's visit to Moscow that interaction between the Soviet Union and France makes it easier to direct international relations into a healthy channel and the current visit by the Soviet foreign minister, Eduard Shevardnadze, to London provides an opportunity for Britain to add a new dimension to a genuine European dialogue in the spirit of Helsinki. Will Britain take this opportunity?

Visit Tied to World Issues

LD142150 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 14 Jul 86

[Aleksandr Pogodin commentary]

[Text] The Soviet foreign minister, Eduard Shevardnadze, has started his official visit to Great Britain. The purpose of his visit is to exchange views on key problems of world politics, above all the issues of security, of reducing international tension and lessening the war menace. An analysis from our commentator Aleksandr Pogodin. This is what he writes:

This visit is another display of the Soviet line to expand the political dialogue with the states of the different social system. Our allegiance to the idea of such a dialogue was clearly reiterated in the documents of the 27th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party and in a number of statements made by the party leader, Mikhail Gorbachev. For example, during the recent stay in Moscow by the French president, Francois Mitterrand, the Soviet Union's resolve was underscored to do its best for the political dialogue to become again a generator of healthy tendencies in international affairs. This amounts to a joint businesslike search for solutions in keeping with the interests of promoting peace and leading to a reduction of the nuclear threat. For the political dialogue to be fruitful it is necessary to discard outdated stereotypes of mentality. Political realism is needed in evaluating the state of and trends in the world situation.

It is on these positions of principle that the Soviet attitude is based to relations with the United States. The Soviet policies will continue to be responsible in order to patiently lay the foundation for the levelling off of these relations.

We favor a dialogue, said Mikhail Gorbachev, but this should be a dialogue in which both sides wish to press for real results. It is impossible to allow talks to turn into a smokescreen to cover up the arms race. The Soviet Union will only [word indistinct] a more serious and responsible attitude by the United States to the disarmament problems, but it has to be noted that Washington's statements about a desire for a constructive dialogue with the Soviet Union obviously do not tally with its practical actions. For example, speaking over the radio a few days ago, President Reagan emphasized his intention to force implementation of the plans for militarizing outer space, the star wars program. He flatly rejected a possibility of this program being discussed at arms limitation talks. For this reason how is it possible to assess the U.S. Administration's attitude to the Soviet-American accord about a joint search for solutions to prevent the extension of the arms race to space?

Mikhail Gorbachev said that the Soviet Union does not slam the door to a political dialogue with the United States, to a summit meeting. We hope, the Soviet leader declared, that the U.S. Administration will join our initiatives and will make it possible to hold such a meeting to work out accords which the peoples of Europe and the rest of the world are hopefully awaiting.

Talks with Thatcher, Howe

LD141738 Moscow TASS in English 1722 GMT 14 Jul 86

[Text] London July 14 TASS -- Eduard Shevardnadze, a member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR minister of foreign affairs, who is staying here on an official visit, met with Britain's Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher.

Eduard Shevardnadze presented to the head of the British Government a personal message from Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

During the conversation they exchanged opinions on a wide range of pressing international problems, as well as on bilateral relations.

The attention of the British side was drawn to the large-scale Soviet foreign policy initiatives and, in the first place, to the concept of creating an all-embracing system of international security put forward in the Political Report of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the 27th CPSU Congress, and to the program of a complete elimination of nuclear and chemical weapons set forth in his statement of January 15, this year. It was emphasized that the realization of the Soviet proposals would permit to put an end to the arms race and would radically improve the world political climate.

The proposals for the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments, contained in the address of the Warsaw Treaty member-states adopted at a meeting of the Political Consultative Committee in Budapest, are also aimed at achieving a radical improvement of the situation in Europe. All this creates a real basis for lowering substantially the level of military confrontation on the European Continent.

It was noted that the creation of an all-embracing system of international security meets the interests of every country and of humanity as a whole. The time has come to prove by deeds, not by words, one's adherence to the cause of averting the war menace.

Eduard Shevardnadze pointed to the need of getting all countries involved in this process. Britain, which carries considerable weight in European and world affairs, can significantly contribute towards that, he said. This also applies to prohibiting nuclear tests, setting up an international code of safe development of nuclear energy, a convention on the complete prohibition of chemical weapons and a number of other issues.

The British prime minister spoke highly about the established practice of a direct dialogue between the leadership of Britain and the USSR on the key problems of the present world and pointed to the importance of her personal meeting and frank conversations with Mikhail Gorbachev.

The sides went on record in favour of the continuation and development of the European process which is making a positive impact on the expansion of the political, trade, economic and humanitarian cooperation on the continent. In line with this goal would be the successful completion of the first stage of the Stockholm conference, i.e. the working out there of concrete confidence-building agreements, and the constructive holding next autumn of the Vienna meeting of the countries -- participants in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

The mutual opinion was expressed in favour of reaching agreements aimed at the consolidation of international security, the limitation and reduction of armaments and the strengthening of strategic stability.

The prime minister of Britain accepted with gratitude the invitation of the Soviet leadership to pay an official visit to the USSR. The concrete date of the visit is to be agreed later.

The meeting was held in a constructive atmosphere, in the spirit of openness and mutual respect.

Talks between Eduard Shevardnadze and British Foreign Secretary Geoffrey Howe were started on the same day. At the first meeting the ministers discussed a number of aspects of the world situation and a complex of questions of Soviet-British relations in the political, trade, economic and other spheres from the viewpoint of their further intensification and development.

Shevardnadze, Howe Speeches

LD151841 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1638 GMT 15 Jul 86

[Text] London, 15 Jul (TASS) -- TASS special correspondents Aleksandr Yevstigneyev and Vitaliy Chukseyev report:

The concluding talks between Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs, and Geoffrey Howe, secretary of state for foreign and commonwealth affairs, has taken place here. The discussion of issues of common interest was continued.

More concretely, a range of issues pertaining to European security was examined. The sides exchanged opinions on the state of affairs at the Stockholm conference and the talks in Vienna on reducing mutual reduction in armed forces and armaments in central Europe. The mutual desire of the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom to develop the pan-European process and to strengthen the cooperation of the states participating in the Helsinki Final Act was stressed.

Both sides noted the significance of reaching agreement on reducing military confrontation on the European Continent.

The two sides also examined issues related to the forthcoming meeting in Vienna of representatives of the countries participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Eduard Shevardnadze invited Geoffrey Howe to pay an official visit to the Soviet Union. The invitation was accepted with gratitude. The exact date of the visit will be discussed later.

The talks were held in businesslike atmosphere and were open and constructive.

Upon completion of the talks, the signing of Soviet-British agreements took place. E.A. Shevardnadze and G. Howe signed an intergovernmental agreement on prevention of incidents at sea beyond the limits of territorial waters, a program of developing economic and industrial cooperation between the USSR and Great Britain for 1986-90, as well as an intergovernmental agreement on settling mutual financial and property claims that emerged before 1939.

E.A. Shevardnadze gave a luncheon in the Soviet Embassy in honor of G. Howe, where an exchange of speeches took place.

E.A. Shevardnadze said:

Esteemed Sir Geoffrey, Esteemed Lady Howe, ladies and gentlemen,

The business part of our visit is over, but the reason for our coming here continues. It is in the interests of this cause and in our common interests to make a due assessment of the work that has been done.

I will start by saying that we are satisfied with the results of the talks.

We can see three aspects of the new stage in the Soviet-British dialogue, which was initiated by M.S. Gorbachev's visit to your country.

Our relations formed in historical areas that did not always divide us. Irrespective of the national interests and international obligations of Russia and Britain, of the Soviet Union and Britain, there has always been and, undoubtedly will continue to be a relationship of interest in each other. This is proved by the fact that at points of breakthrough in world history the interests of our two countries have converged fairly closely, and sometimes fully coincided.

People of my generation well remember the paper BRITANSKIY SOYUZNİK that was published during World War II. We perceived the title of the paper as a familiar concept, and the depiction of a Soviet and a British soldier on the first page of the edition as an eloquent symbol. The sword forged as a gift to Stalingrad by the arms-makers of Winchester has not been obscured in our memory by the rust of oblivion.

The past, in general, pledges us to much, and more so when facing the present. Apart from bilateral ties and contacts, our dialogue also has a visible horizon in the sphere of interalliance relations, where our countries are conducting it as members of the Warsaw Pact and the North Atlantic alliance, as participants in CEMA and in the EEC. The dividing lines do not prevent us from seeing fields of common interest and possible mutually useful cooperation. Political realism and commonsense dictate the pressing need to seek points of contact.

Our very position as European states prompts us toward this. And, together, we will be able to do a great deal so that the role of Europe in the development of the world is genuinely innovative and positive.

Finally, there is the third dimension of our dialogue, determined by the special political and moral responsibility of the USSR and Britain as great powers that possess nuclear arms, as founders of the United Nations Organization, as permanent members of the UN Security Council.

This "triad" of our dialogue that I have set out possesses a single, unifying core, a load-bearing structure, so to speak -- the question of security, national and universal security alike. Naturally, this question turned out to be the central one in our talks, too. We discussed it with Prime Minister Mrs. M. Thatcher, with Foreign Secretary Howe and with other British statesmen and politicians.

In doing this we sought to explain the concept of an all-embracing system of international security, put forward by M.S. Gorbachev at the 27th CPSU Congress. This concept, which was developed with the application of categories of new political thinking, offers a qualitatively new formula for safeguarding security. I would like to stress that it is a question not simply of the substitution by lower values in the security "equation" which has existed so far but also of a radical change in the content of this equation. From it, in our view, such suicidal elements as nuclear, space, and chemical weapons should be excluded forever.

We have come out in favor of the development, the agreeing, and the implementation of a fundamentally different system of security for all in which nonmilitary means of maintaining peace will become the main component. In other words, we are proposing guarantees of a technical, a political, an economic, and a humanitarian order, elevating trust and peaceful coexistence to basic principles of international relations.

This concept contains a philosophical model for ensuring security, a model which, we convinced can be translated into reality. We have sufficiently stated our willingness for this. It has also been confirmed by our practical measures. Soon, a year will have passed since we have carried out any nuclear tests, and this is not simply an argument in favor of our resolve to act, but weighty material evidence of this, too.

We put forward and are willing to put forward other arguments and evidence. Discussions have arisen around them in the past, but unfortunately they have all taken the form of selectively tendentious criticism and carping of a procedural and technical kind behind which has been hiding an unwillingness to face up to the realities of the nuclear age.

I hope that our most respected partners will view with patience our assumption that that road is unproductive. Those who move along it display an inexplicable skepticism about the sensible real alternative and an enthusiastic optimism about military-space fantasies the senselessness of which is obvious.

I will not conceal the fact that I am talking about the "star wars" program. Mankind goes to the stars by way of difficulties, but in the present case the difficulties are such that they are capable of draining mankind dry of blood. A new path -- no matter what may be the intentions of those who pioneer it -- does not always mean movement forward. And here we are up against precisely that kind of case. Replacing certain weapons with others that are more refined is not progress but regression. Sometimes it is much more progressive to stop in good time and to think about the consequences of the choice in question. Ultimately that is what we are suggesting to all our partners, including the British Government. We are suggesting this in the hope that their attitude toward our thoughts and ideas will be unprejudiced, with a desire to see their positive content and to find points of contact that will make it possible to hold a conversation that is full of content and constructive.

On the whole, the discussion of a range of security problems has created quite a good basis, we think, for a further exchange of opinions. The Soviet side is prepared to intensively conduct this and in a businesslike way with the aim of finding practical, mutual understanding.

I think that we can also be satisfied with the specific results of our visit, I am referring to the signing of the three important documents: The 5-year program for economic and industrial cooperation, the agreements on the prevention of incidents at sea, and on settling financial and property claims. They undoubtedly strengthen the legal and treaty basis of our relations and will promote their further development.

We spent 2 very full and intensive days in London but the work did not prevent us from obtaining a picture of English life. The visit to Covent Garden and the forthcoming visit to Parliament introduce variety into the working agenda and make our stay here both pleasant and useful.

Please accept, Sir Geoffrey and Lady Howe, our sincere thanks for the attention and hospitality that have been given us.

I wish everyone here health and happiness.

In his speech, G. Howe expressed conviction that the talks that have taken place have shown that there are opportunities for both countries to work together.

Let me, her said, single out two areas in which we discussed the possibilities for achieving progress: In the first place, arms limitation and, in the second place, the problem of chemical weapons.

We have also achieved progress in the field of bilateral relations. Their development over the past few years was uneven, the foreign secretary continued. Differences in views should not distract us from working together for the purpose of establishing what our common interests are and of removing lack of trust.

It was with this purpose in mind that we signed three agreements today. This bears witness to the fact that by showing patience and goodwill, we can remove obstacles on the path toward better mutual relations. We should make use of this experience in other areas too; in the first place in the field of arms control. Our talks have shown us the directions on which we should concentrate our efforts.

We should use the forms of cooperation which present interest, G. Howe said. We should make them regular, as we should make our meetings regular. I will be looking forward to meeting you in Moscow in accordance with the invitation to visit the Soviet Union next year which I have received. Mrs Thatcher will be also looking forward to her trip to the Soviet Union at M.S. Gorbachev's invitation.

The present moment insistently calls for decisive efforts in the field of arms limitations. I have paid attention to M.S. Gorbachev's thesis on the interdependence of all countries of the world and I agree with it. There are too many problems in the world today, they are too complex and too interrelated for anybody to hide from them. No person and no country can live in isolation today. Theoretically, we all agree with that, but at present the task is to implement this principle in practice.

In the afternoon E.A. Shevardnadze visited the British Parliament, where he attended a sitting of the House of Commons.

In the Parliament building the Soviet minister of foreign affairs met with N. Kinnock, leader of the Labour Party of Great Britain and with D. Healey "shadow" foreign secretary; D. Steel, leader of the Liberal Party; D. Owen, leader of the Social Democratic Party.

E.A. Shevardnadze met with P. Channon, minister of trade and industry of Great Britain. During the talk there was an exchange of views on the condition of and prospects for the development of mutually advantageous trade, and economic and industrial cooperation between the USSR and Great Britain in the coming years.

Today G. Howe gave a large reception in honor of E.A. Shevardnadze. It was attended by eminent British political and public figures, representatives of the business world, and diplomats.

This evening there was a comradely meeting between E.A. Shevardnadze and G. McLennan, general secretary of the Communist Party of Great Britain. E.A. Shevardnadze told of the creative activity of the CPSU and the entire Soviet people to fulfill the

historic decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and of the June plenum of the party Central Committee. G. McLennan spoke about the struggle of the Communist Party and other progressive forces of the country for the rights of the working people, for peace and democracy.

Howe Comments on Talks

LD152106 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 15 Jul 86

[Interview with British Foreign Secretary Geoffrey Howe by correspondent Boris Kalyagin on 15 July, place not given; both speaking in English with superimposed Russian translation -- from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Kalyagin] How do the British leaders assess the results of the talks with Comrade Shevardnadze?

[Howe] All the talks were very useful and were conducted in a businesslike atmosphere.

The conversation between Mr Shevardnadze and the prime minister was concentrated on the most important questions of East-West relations and reaching an agreement on arms control. In his conversation with me, Mr Shevardnadze discussed a wide range of issues concerning regional problems and bilateral relations. All the discussions were of a businesslike nature.

[Kalyagin] How do you now assess the prospects for our relations?

[Howe] I think the relations between our countries will continue to improve. We have common interests -- ensuring security. We must achieve this at a lower level of armaments. We must make progress in the matter of arms limitation. We are also interested jointly in raising the well-being of our people and improving mutual understanding between them. The prime minister and I have received an invitation to visit Moscow next year, and we both look forward to that event.

[Kalyagin] Thank you very much.

[Howe] Thank you.

[Kalyagin] According to a British tradition, television is banned from filming in Westminster Palace where the British Parliament sits. So I will simply tell you that in Westminster today Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze met Neil Kinnock, the leader of the main opposition party in Britain -- Labor. He also had talks with the leaders of the two other opposition parties -- Liberal, David Steel -- and the Social Democratic, David Owen. Later in the evening a talk also took place between Comrade Shevardnadze and Channon, the British trade minister.

Shevardnadze London Press Conference

LD161640 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1546 GMT 16 Jul 86

[Text] London, 16 Jul (TASS) -- E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs, has held a news conference here. Speaking to journalists, he said:

On the whole we are satisfied with the results of the talks.

We handed over a message from M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to Prime Minister M. Thatcher and are satisfied that she accepted the invitation to visit Moscow. A similar proposal was made to G. Howe, the foreign secretary, who also accepted.

So, as you see, a continued Soviet-British dialogue is planned. This continuation gives hope. If we are to talk about how our talks went in the last 2 days, first and foremost I want to refer to the practical results achieved.

For the first time in 10 years three important agreements were signed; moreover, one of them was in the military sphere. I hope that the agreement on preventing incidents at sea will be the forerunner of other fundamental accords between us and other countries in both the East and the West on eradicating the possibility of a most terrible incident -- a nuclear conflict that could end life on earth. In order to prevent this, it is necessary to create reliable guarantees to ensure international security. This was the main element in our dialogue with Britain -- in talks that have already taken place and, doubtlessly, in future talks. In setting forth our positions on this key world problem, we proceeded from the fact that we are dealing with a major power that possesses an arsenal of nuclear weapons and significant armed forces on the European Continent. We see in Britain an equal partner without whose cooperation it is difficult to radically solve the problems of limiting and reducing weapons.

That is why in our talks here we devoted so much time to explaining the Soviet concept of guaranteeing international security in the nuclear space age. This idea was put forward in M.S. Gorbachev's Political Report to the 27th CPSU Congress and it reflects the fundamental principles of the philosophy of peace and proclaims political means for preventing a military threat to be the only possible ones. In our understanding a universal system of international security can and must function by increasing dependence on political, economic, and humanitarian measures with a total renunciation of the use of force and the banning and physical liquidation of nuclear, chemical, and space weapons.

Of course, the differences that exist between our two countries' approaches and appraisals was bound to be manifest during the talks, but there is nothing surprising in that and we shall not dramatize it. Moreover the exchange of views on contentious problems that took place seemed very useful to us. The tone of the discussions was no less important; it was full of the proper approach, a wish to clarify each partner's point of view and to strive to be utterly frank with each other.

We note the realism and sensible approach by the British side in definitely advocating compliance with the existing Soviet-U.S. SALT I and SALT II treaties as well as the ABM Treaty and progress at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space armaments.

We share the view too that a new meeting between the top leaders of the USSR and the United States should end in substantial practical results, above all with regard to security problems. An opportunity was also revealed for joint work on such issues as banning chemical weapons and reducing armed forces and armaments in Europe.

Both sides emphasized the importance of a successful conclusion to the Stockholm conference and of proper preparation for the Vienna meeting of states taking part in the all-European conference. Reaching an agreement on confidence-building measures

in Stockholm could serve, according to our deep conviction, as a good basis for mutual understanding when resolving the problem of reducing conventional armaments.

I would like to highlight the position of the British side on the question of an ABM Treaty too. The British leadership has declared itself clearly to be in favor of rigorously observing this fundamental agreement on strategic arms limitation. We too are resolutely in favor of this.

Strengthening the conditions of an ABM treaty takes on particular significance now that the danger of extending the arms race into space has arisen. Judge for yourselves what really serves the aims of reinforcing strategic stability: removing nuclear and other means of mass destruction from the face of the earth, or deploying in space so-called "defensive devices" with unpredictable consequences for mankind and for the natural environment in conditions of the continuing existence and even growth of nuclear weapons?

One cannot but be amazed at the scientific and technological unscrupulousness of those who advocate the "star wars" program. If you really think about it, what its supporters are proposing is to throw to the winds of space that which is the common property of all mankind.

The Soviet Union is proposing a quite different, more real, hopeful, and more feasible path: to ban once and for all the whole class of space-strike armaments. We are not placing responsibility for this decision on the shoulders of future generations. We are taking it upon ourselves.

We know that the British Government attaches great significance to the problem of monitoring. We also agree that all agreements must be reliably checked. But let us look at the monitoring problems created by the "star wars" program. We have still not heard a word from our U.S. partners as to how it will be possible to carry out monitoring of the so-called "defensive armaments" they have begun to develop [sozdavat].

Where is the border line between defensive and offensive space armaments? Is there one in fact? How can one be sure that a space platform with missiles, lasers, and other technical means will not be used for a first strike? Perhaps our partners will be prepared in this event for an on-site inspection, i.e. in space?

There is, for example, the monitoring of authorized and unauthorized activity as stipulated by the ABM Treaty. We have spoken in favor of open familiarization with the activity of the appropriate laboratories.

With accords in any field, be it nuclear, space, or conventional weapons, the monitoring procedures will directly affect Britain. We hope that the British leadership, the British Government, which is stressing the importance of monitoring so much, will set an example of openness.

During the talks we presented the question of setting up cooperation, including Britain, in the peaceful use of space in the interests of all states.

We think that the talks we have held with British representatives will be quite a good undertaking for the future and will create good prerequisites for continuing a productive dialogue that will serve the cause of peace and universal security, as well as the growth of trust and cooperation between East and West.

Our talks show, and I would like to especially stress this, that there are good possibilities for developing bilateral Soviet-British relations to the benefit of both sides. This concerns political dialogue, trade, economic, scientific, and technological ties, as well as cultural exchanges, and other spheres of bilateral relations.

Allow me to express our gratitude to the British Government, to Prime Minister M. Thatcher, Foreign secretary G. Howe, and to political and public figures for the interest they have shown, for conducting the talks in an interested manner, and for the hospitality shown to us here.

E.A. Shevardnadze then answered numerous questions from correspondents. Regarding the prospects for a Soviet-U.S. summit, he said: This topic has been discussed at the talks in London. We agreed that such a meeting must be crowned with concrete results, especially regarding strengthening security and disarmament. There is an understanding on the British side that concrete accords are needed at this meeting.

Recently, the Soviet side made concrete proposals at the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva on all three aspects of the talks. They create a basis for an accord on an essential reduction of strategic offensive weapons in the conditions of strengthening the ABM Treaty. As far as medium-range missiles are concerned, the USSR also proposed a possible draft agreement in this respect. In a word, it is our belief that it is possible to find acceptable variants to all these problems. But, not having an answer from the U.S., it is difficult for me to add anything to what has been said.

In answering the question as to whether the Soviet side appealed to the British government to use its channels to bring pressure on Washington, E.A. Shevardnadze said: We believe that the British side should not stand aloof from [ne dolzhna ostavatsya v storone ot] the process of resolving problems of strengthening security, halting the arms race, the nondeployment of [nerazmeshchinye] space weapons and other important questions. We have the impression that the British side is ready to become more actively involved in this process.

A number of questions asked by journalists concerned the role and place of the British nuclear potential in resolving the problem of medium-range missiles in Europe. E.A. Shevardnadze, in particular, noted: The USSR's position on this is well-known. The Soviet leadership is in favor of setting up a dialogue between the USSR and Britain on the question of that country's nuclear forces in the overall complex of nuclear problems. In conditions of a reduction of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe we consider it normal to raise the question on the quantitative non-build-up of the British nuclear arsenal. Apart from that, the United States should not hand over its nuclear weapons to other countries.

Answering corresponding questions, E.A. Shevardnadze said that the invitation to M. Thatcher to visit Moscow at an agreed time means that the dialogue between leaders of our two countries which began in 1984 during the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and M. Thatcher will be continued.

That was a good beginning and the prime minister's visit to the USSR will be its useful continuation and will allow the prime minister of Great Britain to learn more about the life of the Soviet people and the Soviet state.

E.A. Shevardnadze answered other correspondents' questions.

Politburo Discusses Visit

LD181513 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 18 Jul 86

[Excerpts] The CPSU Central Committee Politburo on 17 July examined, and in the main approved, the proposals on the transfer of all associations and enterprises of the Ministry of Chemical and Oil Machine Building, as well as a number of associations and enterprises of other industrial ministries, over to complete financial autonomy from the beginning of 1987.

A report from Comrade Shevardnadze on the results of his official visit to Great Britain was discussed. The Politburo noted that the talks between the USSR minister of foreign affairs and the prime minister and foreign secretary of Great Britain, his conversations with the leaders of political parties, and the Soviet-British agreements that were signed are an important step in the continuation of political dialogue between the two countries and the development of their mutually beneficial relations and cooperation on those matters where the sides have common grounds and a common interest in reducing international tension and strengthening peace.

The CPSU Central Committee Politburo examined and made decisions on certain other matters of domestic and foreign policy.

Importance of Visit

LD172032 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 17 Jul 86

[Aleksandr Zholkver commentary]

[Text] Mass media in many countries have commented widely on the results of the visit of Comrade Shevardnadze, minister of foreign affairs of the Soviet Union, to London. Here is Aleksandr Zholkver, our political observer:

Numerous commentaries, notably the British, note that the visit of the Soviet minister to the British capital has become an important event in the positive development of not only Soviet-British relations but in international situation as a whole. THE TIMES for instance writes that following the talks in London, reasons for optimism exist regarding possible progress in various aspects of East-West relations. Indeed, three Soviet-British agreements were signed for the first time in the last 10 years, starting with the program of economic cooperation for the next 5 years and ending with the inter-governmental agreement on the prevention of incidents at sea. The latter is especially important, not only because Britain is known as a major sea power, but also because such an agreement can become a forerunner of other accords between East and West on the elimination of the possibility of the most terrible incident: a nuclear conflict capable of destroying all life on earth.

In the course of discussions in the British capital, a lot of time was devoted to the explanation of the Soviet concept of ensuring international security in our nuclear-space age. This concept, which is built upon the basis of new political thinking, proposes qualitatively new forms of universal security: not only the reduction of the present dangerous military confrontation to the lowest possible level, but also full elimination of such suicidal weapons as the nuclear space and chemical ones. Of course, like everything new, the new concept of universal security does not break through right away. During the talks in London, divergencies appeared in the approaches and appreciations. However, nobody is dramatizing this.

Moreover, it is being noted as a positive fact that the British side expressed itself with full determination for adherence to the Soviet-American treaties on strategic weapons limitation and antiballistic defense and for progress at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space weapons. The two sides also emphasized the importance of the successful conclusion of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security- Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. All in all, as was noted in the British capital, the talks create good prerequisites for continuing a productive dialogue, which serves the cause of peace and universal security.

'Political Goodwill High'

LD182202 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 18 Jul 86

[Nikolay Gorshkov commentary]

[Text] With political goodwill high on the agenda of this week's Anglo-Soviet talks in London, Nikolay Gorshkov examines the outlook for intensifying the Soviet-British dialogue on key issues of international relations:

The Soviet side has made it clear that it sees Eduard Shevardnadze's just completed visit to Britain as helping to lay the foundation for constructive cooperation between London and Moscow. His visit could be thought of as continuing the new stage in the Soviet-British dialogue that began with Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Britain in December 1984. Since then both countries have gone through periods of thaws and chills in bilateral relations. But as the historical record shows both stand to gain from mutual trust and cooperation. Of course we are aware of obstacles on the way to mutual understanding but we believe that goodwill on the part of our two countries, governments, and peoples can overcome the obstacles and the settlement of reciprocal prewar financial claims, just achieved in London, is the latest proof of this.

Good-neighborly relations between Britain and the Soviet Union are of the utmost importance in the overall context of East-West relations. Britain, which we believe carries considerable weight in Europe and world affairs, can significantly contribute to the arms control process. That's why it was important for the Soviet side to get a clear idea of the British position regarding the package of Soviet proposals for cutting nuclear, chemical, biological, and conventional weapons. The implementation of the Soviet proposals would help put an end to the arms race and would radically improve the political climate in the world. As Mikhail Gorbachev told an international group of scientists opposed to nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union naturally hopes for a [word indistinct] response from the American side and from the West in general. We live in a complex, interdependent world, he said, and we must learn to live together no matter how different we are.

In line with this thinking, the Soviet and British sides went on record in favor of further developing the European process which is having a positive impact on the expansion of political, trade, economic, and humanitarian cooperation in Europe. This approach was backed up by the signing of Anglo-Soviet agreements to stimulate trade and to reduce the risk of military incidents on the high seas--agreements that, as the Soviet foreign minister said in London, unquestionably fortify the contractual basis of our relations and will facilitate their further development.

Irrespective of national interests and international commitments, the Soviet Union and Britain have invariably retained and undoubtedly will retain an interest in each other. Political realism and common sense make it imperative for us to seek points of contact. At the very basis of the Anglo-Soviet dialogue lies the problem of security, both national and general. That is why the Soviet side sought to explain the concept of a general system of international security put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev at the Soviet Communist Party congress earlier this year. We have proposed building up such a system exclusively with nonmilitary means of maintaining peace, such as guarantees of a technical, political, economic and humanitarian nature which elevates trust and peaceful coexistence to the status of basic principles in international relations. The replacement of some arms with other more sophisticated ones is a road not forward but backward. It is far more forward-looking on some occasions to stop (?in good) time and to reflect upon the consequences of that or this choice, said the Soviet foreign minister after extensive talks with his British counterpart. In the final analysis, he said, that is what we propose to all our partners, the British Government included. We propose this in the hope that our thoughts and ideas will be treated without prejudice, with a desire to (?discern) their positive contents and find points of contact which make possible a meaningful and constructive discussion.

IZVESTIYA Commentary

PM211037 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Jul 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent A. Krivopalov report: "Encouraging Dialogue"]

[Text] London -- Anglo-Soviet relations are improving. That is the conclusion drawn by THE FINANCIAL TIMES, a highly authoritative and reputable newspaper here. Its assessments are repeated, in different terms, by the serious British press in commenting on the official visit by E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister.

In the talks conducted by the high-ranking guest from Moscow, a wide range of questions were touched upon. He talked with Prime Minister M. Thatcher and Foreign Secretary G. Howe and met with other British statesmen and politicians.

Above all, the British mass media noted the atmosphere in which this exchange of opinions took place -- a calm, businesslike atmosphere. The tone of the discussion was important in itself, being highly tactful and marked by the desire to clarify the partner's position and be extremely frank with him. This style began to establish itself in Soviet-British dialogue after the 1984 visit to Britain by a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by M.S. Gorbachev, when a change for the better emerged in relations between our two countries.

The new stage in the development of bilateral ties and contacts has been marked recently by a series of important visits undertaken by Moscow and London in both directions. A British parliamentary delegation visited the Soviet capital. V.S. Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee, visited Britain.

The USSR foreign minister's trip to Britain was, in the opinion of London commentators, a very important continuation of the Soviet-British dialogue.

What are the concrete, practical results of the visit? Three important documents were signed in London -- a 5-year program for economic and industrial cooperation,

an agreement on preventing incidents at sea, and an agreement on settling financial and property claims. Taken together, they undoubtedly strengthen the treaty and legal basis of relations between the USSR and Britain, and are designed to promote their further development. For the first time in the last 10 years, three Soviet-British agreements have been signed at once, one of them in the military sphere. This has not happened between us and any Western country since the signing of the SALT II treaty. The hope was expressed that the agreement on preventing incidents at sea will be the precursor of other fundamental accords between our countries and other Eastern and Western countries,

The central theme of the talks was the discussion of the problems of peace, security, and disarmament. The Soviet side sought to explain to official London the concept of an all-embracing system of international security that was put forward at the 27th CPSU Congress. The USSR sees Britain as a major, equal partner, without whose cooperation it is hard to resolve radically the problems of arms limitation and reduction. The Soviet side noted, in particular, the realistic, reasonable approach of the British leadership, which declared the need to observe the existing Soviet-American arms limitation and reduction accords and came out in favor of progress at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms.

In particular, official London came out clearly in favor of the strict observation of the ABM Treaty, a fundamental agreement in the strategic arms limitation sphere. Here, too, the Soviet and British positions coincide. The potential was also uncovered for the joint study of such questions as the banning of chemical weapons and the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Europe. Both sides stressed the importance of the successful completion of the Stockholm conference and proper preparation for the Vienna meeting of states that took part in the all-European conference. The sides also agreed that a new meeting between the top USSR and U.S. leaders should end in substantial practical results, above all on security problems.

Of course, it would be naive to suppose that the talks held in London would not reveal the differences that exist in approaches to the assessments of particular problems. That is why talks are needed, in order to exchange opinions on disputed issues and, by seeking mutual understanding, to bring about a convergence of views in the interests of the attainment of general international security. No task is more important than this today. It is from this viewpoint, in our view, that the results of the Soviet foreign minister's visit to Britain should be assessed first and foremost.

The new round of Soviet-British talks created good prerequisites for continuing productive dialogue between our countries. It should serve the cause of peace and universal security and the growth of confidence and cooperation between East and West.

Importance for East-West Ties

LD202029 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 20 Jul 86

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Vsevolod Ovchinnikov, report by Boris Kalyagin from London and interview with Peter Temple Morris, deputy chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Conservative Party -- Kalyagin and Morris in English with superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] This week saw the first visit by a USSR foreign minister to Great Britain after a 10-year break. According to REUTER, the visit is evaluated as an important component in activization of the dialogue between East and West with the aim of overcoming the deadlock in talks on arms control and of promoting a fresh Soviet-U.S. summit meeting.

Having no small weight in European and world affairs, Great Britain can make a substantial contribution to the cause of eliminating the threat of war. This concerns first and foremost a total end to nuclear tests, for Britain was a participant in the tri-lateral talks that put an end to tests in the atmosphere, space, and sea. These talks were broken off shortly before a possible agreement on underground tests was reached.

Second, as it is at the head of the subgroup on chemical weapons at the UN disarmament conference, Britain can promote an agreement on banning and eliminating these weapons. Third, Britain's scientific-technological and industrial potential makes it possible for it to be one of the instigators of an international safety system in nuclear power engineering. In short, there are quite a few potential opportunities for cooperation on all issues where the sides have points of contact and common interest in reducing international tension. To what degree may these opportunities be realized?

[Kalyagin] London is presently in the power of the tourists. They occupy the capital's central streets and squares and crowd the barrier across the entrance to Downing Street, the residence of the British prime minister. Lines form for those wishing to visit the British Parliament, which is traditionally considered the mother of bourgeois democracy. The MP's themselves are going away for their holidays next week, but nevertheless, the dead season has not yet started. The visit to Great Britain by USSR Foreign Minister Shevardnadze has been an important event.

It aroused great interest in British political and public circles. The relations between our two states have taken shape in a very uneven fashion; responsibility for this does not lie with our country. Judging by everything, they have realized the futility of this kind of development in London. As THE TIMES stressed, this visit is of particular importance because it signifies the resumption of normal ties between the Soviet Union and Great Britain.

The chief result of the talks in London was the encouraging continuation of Soviet-British dialogue. For the first time in 10 years, three important agreements were signed simultaneously, one of them in the military sphere. We have not seen such a thing with a Western country since the day the SALT II treaty was signed.

The significance of these meetings in London goes beyond the framework of Soviet-British relations. Key international problems were also discussed during conversations between Eduard Amvorsyevich Shevardnadze and Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and Foreign Minister Howe. Serious differences remained concerning some of them, but a similar position was evident on a number of important issues. In particular, as Comrade Shevardnadze noted at his press conference in London, the British side stated that it advocates observance of Soviet-U.S. accords in the field of arms control, including the SALT II and ABM treaties. The British Government also feels that a new Soviet-U.S. summit meeting should end with tangible, practical results.

The Soviet foreign minister's visit to London was the subject of lively comment in the British press, radio, and television. In the opinion of the majority of observers here, the visit ended in success. It has laid the foundation for development of deeper and more stable relations between the USSR and Great Britain, both in the political field and in trade, economic and cultural ties.

Of course, putting Soviet-British cooperation right is not to the liking of all in Britain. This was shown both by individual hostile comments that appeared in the bourgeois press and by noisy demonstrations arranged by anti-Sovietes of all hues. But they did not express the mood of the British public, of British political and business circles.

Following the end of the visit, we met Peter Temple Morris, a prominent figure in the Conservative Party and deputy chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Parliamentary Conservative Party.

How are the results of Comrade Shevardnadze's visit evaluated in British political circles?

[Morris] For me, this visit was a most important continuation of the line set forth by Gorbachev. I think that your general secretary sincerely desires an improvement in East-West relations, the preservation of peace, and economic cooperation. Shevardnadze's visit reaffirmed this. The Soviet minister made an impression not only through his sensible approach to the issues discussed, but also through his humanity and sincerity, which is very important. I expect that we have every opportunity to develop more energetically our political, economic, and cultural ties. The visit has fostered this.

[Kalyagin] Would you agree that a similar approach to certain international problems by our countries has been evident?

[Morris] Yes, I think the Soviet Union has made a number of important initiatives. These were discussed during the visit; but something else is also very important. In Parliament, while Shevardnadze was present, I called upon our prime minister for our government to play the role of middleman, helping to bring the positions of your country and of the United States closer, and for helping the achievement of agreement in issues such as, for example, a nuclear weapons test ban, the ending of chemical weapons production, and the problem of verification, which is of such concern to Washington.

[Kalyagin] What do you expect of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's forthcoming visit to Moscow?

[Morris] I am very glad that the prime minister is going to your country. It is very important that personal contacts between Gorbachev and Margaret Thatcher are continued. They are strong political personalities and they respect each other. Margaret Thatcher stated after meeting Gorbachev in 1984 that we can work together. That is why she will travel to your country. There are a lot of favorable opportunities for expanding our relations, particularly in the economic sphere. We could help in implementing your economic plans, and the forthcoming visit by Great Britain's prime minister should further this. [End interview]

[Kalyagin] We did not conduct an opinion poll, but from conversations with political figures and ordinary people, one can draw the conclusion that the majority of Britons have an interest in expanding constructive cooperation between the USSR and Great Britain, a cooperation that would serve the cause of peace and universal security.

[Ovchinnikov] July's political calendar is characterized by increasingly frequent contacts between European capitals. The visit by USSR Foreign Minister Shevardnadze to London, notes the Japanese MAINICHI newspaper, followed immediately upon talks between Soviet leaders and French President Mitterrand, and preceded the visit to the USSR by FRG Foreign Minister Genscher. By intensifying political dialogue with the heads of West European countries, the Soviet Union is striving to reduce tension and to improve relations on all the territory of Europe, from the British Isles to the Urals. Well, one need not protest at such a statement.

PRAVDA on Agreements

PM211611 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jul 86 First Edition p 5

[V. Menshikov article under the rubric "We Reply to a Reader": "USSR-Britain: More Detail About the Documents"; first paragraph is reader's letter]

[Text] "I have learned from the newspapers that for the first time in 10 years three important agreements were signed at once during the visit which E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, recently concluded to Britain and that one of them is in the military sphere between the two countries. I would like to learn about these documents in more detail" -- B. Umanets, Krasnodar City.

We are talking of three agreements between the USSR and Britain signed in London 15 July this year: The first document is an intergovernmental agreement to prevent incidents at sea outside territorial waters; the second is a program for the development of economic and industrial cooperation between the USSR and Britain for the period 1986-1990; and, finally, the third is an intergovernmental agreement to settle mutual financial and property claims that arose prior to 1939.

Speaking about the specific results of the visit and the three important documents that were signed, E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, pointed out that they undoubtedly strengthen the treaty-legal basis of Soviet-British relations and will promote their further development.

During the dialogue in London the Soviet side voiced the hope that the agreement on preventing incidents at sea will be the forerunner of other fundamental accords between our countries and other countries in East and West to eradicate the possibility of a most terrible incident -- a nuclear conflict, which could put an end to the existence of life on earth. In order to prevent this, the USSR foreign minister pointed out at a press conference in London, it is necessary to create reliable guarantees of ensuring international security.

It is this aim that is served by the agreement elaborated by the Soviet and British Governments, which contains the sides' pledges aimed at enhancing the safety of voyages by warships and flights by military aircraft outside territorial waters. The agreement provides, in particular, for a channel of communication to be established and for the sides' representatives to hold annual consultations to examine progress in fulfilling the document's provisions and to elaborate additional measures to ensure a higher level of safety for ships' voyages and aircraft flights.

The program signed in London for the 5-year development of economic and industrial cooperation between the USSR and Britain is an expression of the intentions to develop bilateral relations to our mutual advantage and to utilize the existing potential for advancing interstate relations along the path of good-neighborliness and peaceful cooperation and promoting the detente process in Europe.

The program, in particular, provides for the high scientific and technical standard of the equipment and technologies being supplied and for bilateral cooperation in the economic sphere to take priority directions of technical progress, while ensuring favorable finance and credit terms. As the 17 July CPSU Central Committee Politburo session pointed out, the signed Soviet-British agreements are an important step in continuing the political dialogue between the two countries and developing their mutually advantageous relations and cooperation on issues where the sides have points of contact and a common interest in reducing international tension and strengthening peace.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1486

RELATED ISSUES

USSR'S CHERVOV DISCUSSES CHEMICAL WEAPONS, UK NUCLEAR ARMS

London DAILY TELEGRAPH in English 5 Jul 86 p 36

[Article by David Adamson]

[Text]

THE Soviet Union's leading arms expert, Gen. Nikolai Chervov, spoke optimistically in London yesterday about the prospects for an international agreement on chemical weapons.

The main obstacle was no longer the verification of compliance at military facilities but how to ensure that commercial factories were not used to produce materials which, in combination, could be used in weapons.

"If this obstacle is removed there is a chance to reach agreement," he declared. British officials expressed surprise at the chemical weapons committee of the Geneva Conference on Disarmament, and the word from there is that progress is still snagged on the problem of verification.

The Americans have demanded the right of immediate inspection but the Soviet Union says this could be used unscrupulously. It insists that states should have the right to invoke national security as a right for rejecting inspection.

Talks with Howe

The visit by Gen. Chervov, who will address the Royal Institute of International Affairs on Monday, comes a week before that of Mr Shevardnadze, the Soviet Foreign Minister.

He will have talks with Sir Geoffrey Howe, the Foreign Secretary, and arms control and the place in it of the British nuclear force will be high on the agenda talks.

Gen. Chervov said the Soviet Union wanted Britain to agree not to increase the number of nuclear weapons it now possesses.

There was no objection to modernisation, as in the case of the Chevaline warhead, but the Soviet Union remained opposed to the sale to Britain by the United States of the Trident D5 missile.

Mr Zamyatin, the Soviet Ambassador, who sat next to Gen. Chervov at a press conference, commented: "We believe the views of Great Britain as a nuclear power carry weight."

/12828

CSO: 5240/071

RELATED ISSUES

BRIEFS

NATO NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN ITALY--The Defense Ministry has indirectly confirmed the presence in certain districts of Italy of NATO aircraft capable of dropping nuclear bombs. The news became public a couple of days ago as a result of revelations in THE WASHINGTON POST. The aircraft are reportedly stationed at the Italian Air Force bases of Chieti, Rimini, and Aviano. Commenting on the current rumors, a Defense Ministry of Defense press release states that these are questions which fall within the framework of Italy's relations with the countries with which it is allied. [Text] [Rome International Service in Italian 1730 GMT 12 Jul 86] /8309

CSO: 5200/2723

- END -